

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], all of whom are absent by leave of the Senate, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—54

Alken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Smith
Cain	Jenner	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Connally	McCarthy	Umstead
Cooper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Corden	McKellar	Watkins
Dworshak	Maybank	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	White
Eaton	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	O'Connor	Williams
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Reed	Young

NAYS—17

Barkley	Langer	Murray
Green	McFarland	Myers
Hayden	McGrath	Pepper
Johnson, Colo.	McMahon	Taylor
Johnston, S. C.	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	Morse	

NOT VOTING—24

Brewster	Flanders	Martin
Bridges	Fulbright	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Hatch	Overtton
Bushfield	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Kem	Thye
Chavez	Lucas	Tobey
Donnell	McCarran	Tydings
Downey	Malone	Wagner

So the conference report was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for a few days in order to have my eyes treated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to be absent on next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 110, Calendar No. 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator does not intend to proceed with the bill this evening, does he?

Mr. REED. No. I have just conferred with the majority leader. When the motion is voted upon, he will move that the Senate take a recess until Monday.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEWART. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 110.

Mr. STEWART. So that, if the motion is agreed to, that bill will be the pending business on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if the bill is made the unfinished business it is not expected that any action will be taken tonight. I shall move that the Senate take a recess until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—CORRECTION ON ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 3020

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3020) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction: In the matter in parentheses in the section designated as "Sec. 15" in title I, change the figure "10" to "11."

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Monnett B. Davis, of Colorado, to be the Representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

AMERICAN MISSION FOR AID TO GREECE

Dwight P. Griswold, of Nebraska, to be Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM

Richard F. Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be Field Administrator of the United States Foreign Relief Program, pursuant to Public Law No. 84, approved May 31, 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, who knowest all and lovest all, mercifully hear our supplication. As each day brings new duties, may we waste no time on lost opportunities, but turn the leaf of another day and behold the page with confidence and assurance. Remind us that whatsoever we sow that shall we also reap; like falling grain, it revives and springs again. We pray Thee to give hope and purpose to our labors, lest weary human flesh sow but little and have naught else. Humble our pride and disturb our overconfidence. When we are selfish, forgive; when we wander astray, recall; and when we think ill of others, do Thou restrain. O lift us to those lofty tablelands of the soul against which the storm may beat in vain. Be unto us a shaft of light breaking through the clouds, and those who have sown in tears shall reap in joy.

Grant Thy blessings of comfort, safety, and good health upon our President and his household.

In the Saviour's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of the late William E. Borah and tendering the thanks of Congress to the State of Idaho for such contribution.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to notify the House of Representatives that Mr. SPARKMAN has been appointed conferee on H. R. 3203, an act relative to maximum rents on housing

accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, in lieu of Mr. FULBRIGHT, excused.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Star entitled "Handicapping Justice."

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pontiac (Mich.) Daily Press.

HENRY WALLACE AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, Republicans everywhere should join in singing the Doxology.

A reporter asked Henry Wallace in Raleigh, N. C., yesterday if he would support the Republican Party in 1948, and Mr. Wallace replied that he could not imagine himself campaigning for a Republican under any circumstances.

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. He also said that he would not support Harry Truman, so we will also join in the Doxology.

Mr. BREHM. Then let us make it unanimous.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. Gossett) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Judiciary in charge of immigration be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication addressed to His Excellency Hon. William M. Tuck, Governor of Virginia, by the

members of the State Corporation Commission of the Commonwealth of Virginia on the settlement of the telephone dispute in Virginia.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include certain articles and newspaper clippings.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of consumer credit and include a statement he made before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. COFFIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Farm Journal.

COMMUNISM IN EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday President Truman very rightly condemned the steal of Hungary by the Communists. I am sure every American joins him in that protest. But, Mr. Speaker, I have been listening a long, long time to hear that same kind of protest concerning the steal of Poland, the steal of Estonia, the steal of Latvia, and the steal of Lithuania. Such a protest, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN DENOUNCES COMMUNISM IN EUROPE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, first I desire to compliment President Truman for denouncing the Communists taking over Hungary. It is now in order to denounce their taking over Bulgaria.

I also desire to join the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] in saying that I should like to see him do the same thing with reference to every other country that has been overrun by the Communist Party in Europe which is dominated by a minority racial group that is perpetrating the most sadistic brutality ever known on the innocent people of Russia, Hungary, Poland, and every other country they have overrun.

I say it is time for the American people, with the President leading the way, to break relations with every Communist controlled country in the world and let it be known that we will not do business with any gangster government on earth. I will not only join him in that fight, but I will contribute every ounce of energy I have to driving communism from our shores, and encouraging the people of Europe to restore self-government and free themselves from the criminal perse-

cution to which they are now subjected at the hands of the sadistic racial minority which now dominates them from Moscow.

In that way we can free our own country of this communistic filth and at the same time encourage the Christian nations of Europe to free themselves from the most cruel system of brutality and slavery this world has ever known.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the consideration of House Resolution 224.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the few short months I have been a Member of this distinguished body there have been a great many matters of legislation about which misrepresentation, much abuse, and many misstatements have been made. However, I feel that in the case of the so-called Voice of America perhaps more has been said in error than upon any other single piece of legislation with which I have been associated. It is perhaps one of the most misunderstood pieces of legislation that this House has had under consideration for several months.

The United States of America has but one commodity for sale in the markets of the world. That commodity is a way of life. It is, if you please, a way of freedom. It is what we have come to know as the American way. We have nothing else to sell. We do not seek to be aggressors. We do not seek the acquisition of the lands or the rights of other peoples. We have but one item to sell and that item is the truth about how we live in this country. Oppression and tyranny are riding throughout the world. The peoples of the other nations of the earth are largely in intellectual darkness. Those who rule them are determined that they shall not come to know a better way of life or better conditions of living. It is this situation that the so-called Mundt bill proposes to meet with positive and aggressive action. It is proposed that we carry a message of hope into darkness, that we light the lamps of knowledge, and that we give the other peoples of the earth something to look forward to besides oppression and tyranny.

Much has been said about the personalities connected with this program. Much has been said about the inefficiency of operation; about the poor selection of material to be broadcast. But actually, for an operation of this magnitude, for an operation which has continued unabated for some 20 months, there have been very, very few instances in which serious errors have been made. Personally, I think the broadcasting feature of the program has been overstressed. Actually the Voice of America, as that term pertains to the radio broadcasts, is but a small feature of the measure now under consideration. There are a great many other aspects. There is the aspect of the exchange of students, the aspect of the exchange of professors on a reciprocal basis.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask a question about these broadcasts. Is there any provision in this bill for Congress to see copies of these broadcasts and to know what is being broadcast to Europe? I know some people, even on the Federal pay roll, that I would not risk to tell what America is doing and what the people of this country think. I think there ought to be a provision for everyone of these broadcasts to be filed with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am quite certain that copies of the broadcasts are available upon request, or could be sent upon request.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. How about the reception sets in the other countries. Are they permitted to listen in on our broadcasts?

Mr. JACKSON of California. As far as we have been able to determine from the testimony given before the subcommittee on this bill, there is no restriction at the present time upon the short-wave receivers.

Mr. BREHM. Even in Russia?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Not even in Russia. Naturally, I do not know exactly how many but hundreds of thousands of persons listen to the Voice of America broadcasts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under this bill do we get teachers from Russia to come over here and teach in our colleges, universities, and schools?

Mr. JACKSON of California. There is written into the bill the proviso that all exchange of students and professors must be on a reciprocal basis and that if any professor, student, or any other person receiving benefits under this act engages in political activity or activities detrimental to the best interests of the United States they shall be deported.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but we never deport them.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Sixty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Byrnes, Wis.
Barden	Boykin	Carson
Beall	Buckley	Celler
Bell	Burleson	Chelf

Clark
Clements
Clippinger
Cole, Kans.
Combs
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dingell
Domeneaux
Doughton
Douglas
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Flannagan
Fogarty
Fuller
Gallagher
Gamble
Gifford
Gorski
Granger
Hale
Hall,
Leonard W.
Harless, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Hart
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hendricks

Hess
Hoeven
Holmes
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Kee
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Klein
Landis
Lane
Lesinski
Love
McCormack
Macy
Mansfield, Tex.
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Miller, Md.
Mitchell
Morrison
Norton
Owens
Pace
Pfeifer
Philbin

Ploeser
Plumley
Powell
Rabin
Rayfield
Reed, Ill.
Reeves
Rich
Riley
Rizley
Rooney
Ross
St. George
Sarbacher
Sasser
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Seely-Brown
Short
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Snyder
Stockman
Sundstrom
Tollefson
Van Zandt
Wadsworth
West
Whitten
Youngblood
Zimmerman

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bedford Daily Times-Herald.

Mr. McCONNELL (at the request of Mr. TIBBOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made recently.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF WILLIAM E. BORAH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 accepting the statue of the late William E. Borah, and tendering the thanks of Congress to the State of Idaho for such contribution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of the late William E. Borah, presented by the State of Idaho, now in the Capitol Building, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens illustrious for his historic renown and distinguished civic services.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Idaho.

The resolution was agreed to

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, prompted by what was said on the floor here this morning prior to the call of the roll, I wish to observe that in my official career I have proceeded upon the belief that no man in public life was entitled to a private opinion on a public question. As a result of following that course I have often found myself at war with others but always at peace with myself.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 319 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit and hold hearings today during the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3737.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Cecil B. Dixon.

Mr. MASON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John O'Donnell appearing in the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Striking Similarities of Nazism, Fascism, and Communism."

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his re-

Mr. Speaker, I get a great deal of comfort out of witnessing the change of feeling that has come over official America. But I would like to say that it is going to take more than protests and denunciation to cure the evils in the making, of which we are in part responsible. The policy of appeasement that we too long pursued has resulted in the creation of a force that has all the world, with the exception of ourselves, trembling in their boots. I want to see positive action taken—a proving of faith by deeds. Promises are not sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of good, in my opinion, is going to come out of the situation brought about by the Appropriations Committee in refusing to make appropriation for the particular activity with which we are concerned in the consideration of the pending resolution. The committee probably based their action upon the ground that no legislative authority existed for the making of the appropriation, but I suspect that the controlling thing which influenced the action of the committee was the lack of confidence that the committee had in the administration of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who some time ago attacked this particular activity of the State Department, and I think there was abundant justification for the position that we took at that time. I must say, however, that the picture has completely changed in the past several months and that the agency in the State Department carrying on this work is an entirely different group, in the main, from what it was when the State Department took over following the passing out of the OWI.

I am convinced that this is an activity which the security and the welfare of our country demand we carry on. It is not propaganda in the sense that we are endeavoring to mislead or to bring about an attitude false to the best interests of other people; it is something that we must do to make ourselves understood, to meet and to resist the campaign, world-wide in character, that is being waged mainly against the United States by Soviet Russia.

Let me say at this point that England, as unfavorable as her economic situation happens to be, is at this time expending between forty and forty-five million dollars in her informational program. The amount of money that is being requested by the State Department is, in my opinion, insufficient to carry on this informational program in the manner that it should be conducted, but will suffice to keep it going. I know what is troubling the membership of this House. Members are not so much against the continuation of the program as they are against the personnel which has been carrying on the program. They have the fear that people who are too far to the left are being used—people who are more interested in reform than in telling the story of America.

Much of the criticism against the State Department's international information program centers around its administration, and thus around the man responsible for its execution—William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Criticism of Mr. Benton, I be-

lieve, is wholly unjustified, and altogether unfair. In my opinion it would be difficult to find a man better qualified, in his business background, previous experience, ability as an organizer, and in his talents for leadership to head this vitally important Government activity than Bill Benton. One of the most successful independent businessmen in the country, and with an equally impressive record of achievement in education, Bill Benton, during the past 2 years, has done a remarkable pioneering job, in organizing and directing the Government's program to tell to the world the story of the United States.

Bill Benton has a thoroughly American background. His father, a professor at the University of Minnesota, died when he was a boy of 10, and his mother moved to a Montana homestead, following the spirit and example of the pioneers who built America. There followed a period that was tough for both the mother and the children. But hard work and the pioneer spirit prevailed. His mother later became a well-known and successful teacher, and the boy went to the Shattuck Academy, in Minnesota, and afterward to Yale University, where he graduated with the class of 1921.

From 1922 to 1936, Benton was in the advertising-agency business. In this he made a spectacular success, directing many large advertising campaigns, and pioneering in the use of radio in advertising.

At 35, having accumulated a substantial fortune, he decided to retire from the advertising business. In 1937 he accepted a vice presidency of the University of Chicago, on a 6 months-per-year basis. At the University of Chicago, his main activities were in developing new instruments of education, particularly broadcasting, motion pictures, and publications. At the suggestion of Benton, the University of Chicago acquired the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., and, in 1943, he became chairman of the Encyclopaedia Britannica board. Under his leadership, the Britannica expanded into the field of classroom motion pictures through its subsidiary, Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc.

During his free 6 months' period, Benton participated in founding the Committee for Economic Development, of which he was vice chairman until he came to the State Department. He played a vitally important part in directing the work of the Committee for Economic Development, which had the support and participation of many of the country's leading businessmen and industrialists.

Benton also had other business interests. He acquired ownership of several small companies in the fields of music publishing, broadcasting service, and wired music, the key company of which is the Muzak Corp.

Mr. Benton's success as a businessman is evidenced by his record of building up the capital value of the companies he owns. Since 1937, with a capital investment of less than \$250,000, these companies have been so successful under his direction that their capital value today is estimated at close to \$10,000,000.

In August 1945 Benton was appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. In accepting this post he gave up all his outside interests involving operating responsibilities.

Benton faced a gigantic and challenging job in the State Department. It included the direction of the work of the State Department in projecting to foreign peoples a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government, helping to develop in the American people a closer understanding of the problems and policies in the field of foreign affairs, and responsibility for United States participation in the United States Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

I doubt if any man in the executive departments has worked harder than Bill Benton during the past 2 years. He averages 12 or 14 hours a day on the job. Benton has labored continually to improve the personnel in his organization, and increase the efficiency of the operations for which he is responsible. The evidence that has accumulated speaks eloquently of the success achieved by the international information service in combating misrepresentations of the United States, and telling the facts about this country and its policies. Equally impressive is the evidence of the need for continuing, over a long period, the Department's information program as an essential arm of our foreign policy.

At this point I should like to insert the following telegram received by a number of Members of Congress. The telegram, which speaks for itself, is as follows:

As trustees of the University of Chicago we have worked closely with William Benton for many years as vice president of the university and later as a trustee. As head of Encyclopaedia Britannica and Britannica Films as well as other business interests Benton is one of the very successful independent businessmen in the country. His business experience together with his background in education—8 years as vice president of the University of Chicago—his success in publishing and in educational motion pictures and radio, in our opinion qualified Benton in an unusual way to administer the international information services and cultural program.

This telegram was signed by John Nuveen, Jr., Nuveen & Co.; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co., Indiana; Frank Sulzberger, president, Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co.; Graham Aldis, Aldis & Co.; Edward Eagle Brown, chairman of the board, First National Bank, Chicago; Harold H. Swift, vice chairman of the board, Swift & Co.; Walter P. Paepcke, chairman of the board, Container Corp. of America; Paul C. Russell, president, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

I should also like to insert excerpts from a letter published in the Washington Post, May 17, signed by five men closely associated with Mr. Benton in various civic activities.

The kind of criticism that is now being leveled at Bill Benton is the kind of thing that keeps responsible and able people from going into Government work. It may be an effort to save face on the part of those who questioned the need for OIC. The sudden decision that the operation is important but

that there must be something the matter with Benton is an old and familiar pattern in Government and one that we protest in this case. Benton's record as a businessman and an administrator is well known to those in the business community.

He is one of the most successful independent businessmen in the United States; one of us can speak with special authority on this subject, because Mr. Hoffman serves as a member of the board of directors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica and of Britannica Films and knows of the extraordinary progress these companies made under Benton's leadership in the last 5 years.

He combines with this business experience a background in education (8 years as vice president of the University of Chicago), in broadcasting, in publishing, and in educational motion pictures. He has experience, skill, and enthusiasm, and he has an Americanism rooted in his boyhood in Minnesota and Montana that has found expression in every phase of his thinking and his career.

Bill Benton is the top man in the country for this job. It would be difficult indeed to find anyone who matches his initial qualifications for administering America's international information and cultural program. And it would be tragic, for the sake of a political maneuver, to waste the 20 months of experience he has acquired in mastering an assignment that is as new and unfamiliar to our country as it is necessary.

Signers of the letter were Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corp.; Ralph E. Flanders, United States Senate; Eric A. Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association; Walter D. Fuller, president, Curtis Publishing Co.; Marion B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.

I know Bill Benton personally, and have the utmost confidence in his competency to direct the activities of the State Department for which he is responsible. I do not think General Marshall could find a better qualified man for the job. The country needs a vigorous and efficient international information program, and I believe there are many Members of Congress who share my hope that General Marshall will retain Bill Benton as the directing head of this State Department agency.

We have at the head of the State Department the best man that came out of the war. He is not only a great soldier; he is a great statesman, and probably enjoys a larger measure of public confidence than any other living American; and given a free hand, as I believe he is being given, he will make a record unsurpassed in the field of statecraft and diplomacy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Now then, just waving aside the program of telling the world about the United States, you provide here for the interchange of instructors. Does the gentleman know that communism is being spread in the educational institutions of America largely by those foreign immigrant professors who come in here for that purpose?

Mr. COX. I am not combatting the charge—

Mr. RANKIN. And we are simply augmenting that policy in this bill.

Mr. COX. Let me say to the gentleman that the bill provides for a screening of personnel, not only by the FBI, in

whom everyone has confidence, but by the security group within the State Department that performs quite as efficiently as does the FBI.

Mr. RANKIN. But it does not screen the ones they send us. We screen the ones we send them, but the poison is being spread by the ones that have flooded in here and are now teaching in educational institutions of America, spreading communism among American students.

Mr. COX. This whole matter revolves around the question: How much confidence have you in General Marshall?

Mr. RANKIN. I have confidence in no man sufficient to authorize him to open the floodgates to a lot of Communists to come here and mislead the children of this country. But, remember, General Marshall does not screen the ones coming here from behind the "iron curtain."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman now addressing the House has the reputation for being fair and honest second to none, and I am sure that he does not want anything to be in the Record that is not absolutely true. If I recall right, he made the statement that they have an entirely new set-up down there.

Mr. COX. I said in the main.

Mr. BUSBEY. And that they have gotten rid of this OWI crowd.

Mr. COX. In large part. The OWI personnel has been eliminated in large part. There were many good and very able people connected with OWI and a few of those are still being used.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say for the gentleman's information that I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the personnel records of this group in Paris, France. They have nine people. Six of the nine are still hold-overs of the old OWI crowd in Paris.

Mr. COX. If there are undesirable people still in the State Department can we not and should we not, rely upon General Marshall to get rid of them? That is my feeling about this question. I indulge the profound conviction that we would make a grievous mistake if we did not authorize this appropriation and continue the foreign informational service that is now being carried on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. General Marshall will not have anything in the world to say about the professors that are sent here from Europe any more than he has to say about the ones that are in here now, as I said, poisoning the minds of the students of this Nation.

Mr. COX. Let me say that I have a different opinion of General Marshall. He is no painted front, he is in the State Department to run it, and he is going to run it if he performs as I am confident he will. It is his responsibility to chase out of the Department the little and bad people still remaining there and

thus recapture for the Department the confidence of Congress and the country which it should enjoy.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman know that the committee wrote in on page 3 beginning in line 21 this sentence:

If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall be promptly deported.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Minnesota had gone through the hearings we have, he would find how hard it is to pin that label on these Reds who are today teaching in some of our schools and spreading communism throughout the United States.

Mr. JUDD. We do not say if they are members, we say if they are advocating things not consistent with our security they shall be deported.

Mr. COX. Russia is on the air 24 hours out of the day disseminating false information about the United States. Are we to sit silently by and see this continue? Are we to deny ourselves the right and privilege to tell our own story, to interpret our own acts, and to draw a picture of our own national life? I trust that you will not permit your afore-taken opinions to hold in the light of the record that was made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They had before them the present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, who was formerly Ambassador to Russia; General Smith, the present Ambassador to Russia; General Marshall, and General Eisenhower, all of whom were unanimous in the opinion that this activity is essential as a part of the foreign program of the State Department.

On the question of the merits of the bill, consideration of which the pending rule makes in order, Secretary Harriman, who was formerly Ambassador to Russia, testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs as follows:

Certainly it is a fact that with our world trade running to imports and exports substantially in excess of \$20,000,000,000, it is essential to our commercial interests to have America understood, its life, the quality of its workmanship and the quality of its products, follow a general sympathy for a nation and its objectives.

In terms of percentages of this approximately \$20,000,000,000, I think it is not an exaggeration to say that the total appropriations asked for is something like one one-thousandth of the sum that I have been speaking of, so that I believe that from only the commercial aspect it will be justified, but, as I say, the commercial aspects are secondary to the other objectives.

As I say, there were two fundamental misunderstandings about America and that was due to the fact, naturally, that the normal channels of commercial news cover the things that are bought by the British publications, and the British people are like us, they like sensational news, they like something which is stimulating and interesting to read, and

such part of the limited British press rather tended to emphasize such things as our strikes. At that time there was already an inflationary spiral of price increases.

I assure you that the British people got the impression that we were in more or less a chaotic economic condition. If there was a riot in connection with a strike, naturally that was news.

The other misunderstanding came from the drive that was on in the United States to get food for Europe and the hungry areas. In addition to that there had been the fact that we had gone off rations. It was of great interest to the British people, because they were on rations. The things that were said in the press at that time, encouraging the people to cooperate in making food available to take care of the hungry areas was naturally published.

Therefore the impression you would get, the general impression of the cautious reader, would be that America was in an economic chaotic condition and that we are living in greed and that we were not thinking of any of the suffering that existed anywhere in the world.

I cannot state too fully my opinion that this program is an essential part of our foreign program and without monitoring what other people say against us, without stating on an affirmative basis what our objectives are, what our principles are, what life is in America, our reputation can only suffer.

There has been a good deal said about some individuals here, there, or the other place. My impression is, from where I have seen them, not only in Moscow and London but in my travels around, that the men we have abroad on this service are a very high type, high quality, and balanced kind, and as many newspapermen are, they know how to work and they work overtime and long hours.

We are inadequately staffed everywhere but those people have enthusiasm for their work and morale is good. We have many high-quality people. I mention Dr. Nevins and I assume you would know of him, as an example of the quality of our representatives on the other side.

However, the flow of information back to the State Department is a very important aspect of our work and it is of very great importance to our political negotiators in terms of knowing how to deal with critical questions that come up.

When General Smith, now Ambassador to Russia, was before the committee he testified, in part, as follows:

General SMITH. I would like to say, by way of preamble to you and to the other members of the committee, that, of course, I am competent to speak on this very important question only from the point of view of an American representative to the Soviet Union, and my knowledge of the broadcasting program now being conducted by the State Department is limited to that part of it which is directed toward the Soviet Union.

In that particular phase we have had, and continue to have, the most intense interest, because we think it is a vitally important thing.

I see it this way: Those of you who visited Europe as the guests of our headquarters after the war, and some of you who traveled with me, will realize that as a result of the aftermath of the war the people of central Europe are in a state of mental confusion, mental and physical depression, the like of which it is impossible for the average American to imagine. They do not know which way to turn. The political ideologies on which they have pinned their faith in the past have proved false. They are groping for a ray of light and they are susceptible to almost any form of propaganda that will offer

them something in the way of hope for the future.

This country has a commodity to sell which is in demand everywhere in the world, and that is a democracy which we have proved to ourselves, by experiment and experience, provides a decent way of life for the average citizen; provides a basic respect for human liberty and for the rights of the individual. That is something for which there is a crying demand everywhere in the world.

I have heard it said that democracy should sell itself by its own basic transcendent value, and without advertising. That is a theory of "the man who builds a better mousetrap" type. I do not know whether this theory actually works in the present day, when all sorts of political ideologies, some of which are not acceptable to us, are attempting to sell themselves by much more forceful means and by direct advertising.

You could not sell soap without advertising, and I do not believe that you can sell any other commodity, even one which is in as great demand as the American brand of democracy.

In Europe the air is filled for 24 hours a day with recommendations of various brands of political ideologies that we think are inferior to the commodity that we have to offer. And I submit most respectfully that if we remain silent in the face of this flood of advertising we simply will turn over the groping peoples of Europe to forces which are not entirely compatible with the way of life that we consider desirable and representative of real democracy and human freedom and human dignity.

We do not intend, nor do we wish, to set up any invidious comparisons between our country and any other country, but we do think that it is desirable that the citizens of the rest of the world understand our way of life, how our people live, how they go to school, what the farmer does, what the workingman does, and understand definitely that our people believe in peace; that we are working hard for peace; that we are striving to implement the only agency we see capable of bringing about a condition of world peace—the United Nations; and that the efforts we make to help people elsewhere in the world are not selfish and are not based on political imperialism, but are genuinely altruistic.

Mr. JUDD. You are willing to say on the record that on the whole these programs have been effective in giving more information, and a more accurate picture of America?

General SMITH. Indeed I do, and they will continue to be effective, increasingly effective, as the technical difficulties inherent in broadcasting the vast distance involved are overcome, and as the programs are revised and improved to appeal to the tastes of the Soviet listener.

Mr. JUDD. When I asked about more and better programs, I had in mind also mechanical standards.

General SMITH. I would like to point out that it took a long time for the BBC to build up the present audience and their reputation for credibility. As matter of fact, it took them many months to whip the technical difficulties involved in broadcasting to eastern Europe. I have been interested in noting that our own people have overcome to a large extent those difficulties in an infinitely shorter time. We have profited by the mistakes that the BBC made, and our technical people have been very good. I should say if we graph the relative excellence of our broadcasts, ours would go up in a sweeping curve like this just in a matter of weeks, whereas the BBC took a long time

to accomplish the same results. It will take us a long time, too, to raise our program to the level we want to attain. We cannot expect to do this in a matter of months. It has to be a continuing program, and we have to approach it intelligently and objectively. I say again that I agree with you, that an honest, uncolored, straightforward presentation of our ideals seems to me, not knowing very much about it, the best approach. I have never liked to think of these present broadcasts at all as propaganda. I do not consider them propaganda. We are simply telling our story.

General SMITH. I am not a regular member of the State Department. I belong by profession by another one, and I must state quite frankly here that I think the job has been extremely well done. I have been surprised. As a professional soldier, you know, we do not always throw flowers at the diplomats. It is not in our military tradition to do so, but I must say they have tackled this thing; and I think as far as the Russian broadcasts are concerned, they have tackled it amazingly well.

In Moscow we sit in and listen. I have this sort of informal advisory board. The press is included. We are a small family. There are not too many Americans in Moscow, and we hang together pretty well. The corps of correspondents there are practically the same as members of the family.

Mr. JARMAN. In view of my agreement that not only a cross section of our country and the events which occurred in it should be presented on this program, but also that it should be an absolutely accurate picture, and uncolored, it naturally follows that I also agree that whenever an isolated lynching occurs in the South it should be referred to, because we have so very few down there that the references will be so few and far between that it would not do our country any harm.

General SMITH. There is no reason, Mr. Congressman, why we should not tell the truth about it. The Soviet press is well represented in this country. TASS has an able corps of reporters and correspondents, and they report back to the Soviet Union. They cover the news well over here. If we did not make reference to things like that, which appear normally as items of American news to the Soviet press, we would lose out.

Furthermore, take the last lynching. The important thing to inform the Soviet citizens about is that while there was a lynching the most determined efforts were made by the State and Federal Governments to bring the perpetrators of the atrocity to trial. They are being tried. The fact that they are being tried should be recorded and should be made known to the Soviet Union. Otherwise, the Soviet citizens would gain the impression that whenever there is a lynching reported there is a corpse hanging from every lamp-post and nothing whatever is done.

Let me quote from testimony given by General Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower testified:

On the other hand, through the war I and all of my associates were constantly struck by the appalling ignorance that exists throughout the world about the United States; things that we take so much for granted that we do not even think about them are completely unknown to much of the world.

I have this theory, sir. I believe that most of you here would agree with me that we instinctively trust nations in which the power resides in the hands of people, because we believe that people do not want wars.

Therefore, I feel that the more the advantages of that type of government are spread

throughout the world the more likely it will be that that system is followed by other countries, many of which are now trembling in the balance. They do not know which way to go.

If they can find out what we believe to be the advantages of our system, they should, and we believe that they would, go along in that line. The more that that system is practiced throughout the world, certainly the fewer will be the potential aggressors in the world, and as a result the more secure we will be. There is where I come into the picture.

To my mind, the more democracy is practiced in the world the more secure we are, and therefore the less we would have to pour into armies and navies, and such other sterile organizations that produce nothing for this country.

Therefore, in my opinion there is this field that must not be neglected, in the exchange of students and the getting out of facts. I do mean facts about the standards of living we have in this country and our workmen, in terms of dollars, necessarily. I think it ought to go out in terms of ice boxes, radios, cars, how much did they have to eat, what they wear, when they get to go to sports spectacles, and what they have available in the way of art galleries and things like that.

I think there is no field that can be neglected. However, the organization you need, and the technique, there I must say I am not only ignorant; it is not my business.

Mr. LODGE. Thank you very much, General.

I assume that you also feel that living as we are now in a period of conflict, though not at war, this program has an even greater significance than it would have in a normal period of peace?

General EISENHOWER. I most certainly do. I believe in the positive program of trying to lead the world toward democratic forms of life and I do not see how you are going to do it unless they have the knowledge with which to make their own conclusions and decisions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. General, I am very glad to hear your whole-hearted and outspoken approval of a program of this sort.

Now in your opinion, if we are going to pour dollars into different countries throughout the world to feed people, and necessarily so, do you think it would be a necessary corollary to implement that policy as well as to implement the policy of aid to Greece and Turkey, to at the same time bring the true story of America to as many people as we possibly can so they will understand what we stand for? Truth is the best propaganda.

General EISENHOWER. I believe it so thoroughly, sir, that to my mind there is nothing to argue about.

I can see no significant reason that you could bring to bear against that general proposition.

Now the facts of history—though not all of them—would lead these people to give us the trust that we should like to have; in spite of some unpleasant aspects of our past, we do honestly believe in the purity of our motives today, and therefore I think that it is another region in which education throughout the world is necessary.

We are going to use our power, our influence and our wealth to lift people up and to give them a chance to live their own lives. If we are to do that they must know the facts about the country on which they are depending.

Therefore, as I say, the only thing we can do is put out the truth about it, and I do not believe in doing it in an antagonistic

manner. I do not believe we should challenge anybody in this world.

My theory is that we can all live peacefully together if we will each have a little sense, but truth is the important thing to help us develop some sense, all of us.

As I see it, if you go into this thing, you must go into it on a basis of a long-term proposition.

As I say, it is not merely the beaming out of facts. I would encourage the exchange of students, of scientists, of doctors, of instructors, of even theologians; anything you could think of that would tend to carry back into these various countries an understanding of what we are doing and just how we live, and we, in turn, getting some clearer idea of why people act thus and so. We think we offer a reasonable proposition, for example, in the atomic bomb. We think we are very reasonable. Others do not seem to think so. Why? What is the background of it? Because the more you understand these difficulties, the better will be our own programs in turn.

I believe it should go in the fields of art, science, and everything. Everything educational.

I would consider the use of just what you would call publicity, or let us say the propaganda phase of it, if you want to use that word, as a mere part of the whole program. Possibly not all of it needs to be Government-supported.

If we can get our great colleges, institutions, and foundations of that kind interested in this thing we will improve all the way through.

Therefore, I would say that you could not expect to reach those people very quickly, and on a very broad base at first.

There is another thing we know, that science will constantly bring to us easier and better ways of getting information. One day it will practically be impossible for the Government to say, "You may not have a radio that will pick up anything but a particular wave length," because science will go so far that anyone can learn what someone else is saying on that radio.

Mr. Judd. I think the question that has caused more discussion, not only in this committee but in the Congress, and perhaps all through the country, is the question of personnel. There is little disagreement as to the need for some such program, and the importance of it. Three things are essential to its success: A sound plan, money, and then men to administer. The biggest question is the kind and quality of the men to administer it.

Have you had kick-backs, favorable or unfavorable, from the type of personnel that has been working in this program in the various countries abroad?

General EISENHOWER. There has been no word of criticism come to me. I will go out personally and voluntarily and vouch for people that I have been with in periods of stress and strain, and I will say that if General Marshall cannot pick the right kind of people, then I do not know who can.

Mr. Judd. General Smith told us, and we had read in the paper about one man in the Embassy in Moscow who did not come up to specifications.

General EISENHOWER. He fired him, too.

Mr. Judd. I know it. You have not heard of other cases of that sort?

General EISENHOWER. No. If they found someone who was not operating, they would get rid of them.

Mr. Judd. Have you had any reports that said, "Over in the Embassy one of the State Department men is a so-and-so, and causing more trouble than he is doing good, and we wish that he could be eliminated"?

General EISENHOWER. I cannot recall any specific instance, but I have had many others of exactly the contrary type, where heads of our mission and people working with our

military people in places like Russia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and so on, they stated exactly the opposite, that they have a happy family, and they all work together.

Now let us see what General Marshall said. I quote from his testimony:

As I said some time ago, when I returned from China it was apparent to me that we had to take very definite action in order to have the United States and its purposes understood by the people generally in the world and that we had no conception here at home as to how little we were understood and to what degree we were misrepresented.

This bill would at least permit us to interpret ourselves to the world and have our motives better understood, and what we have done better comprehended.

I had an experience in propaganda in China which was very instructive, and it there became glaringly apparent to me that the only basis on which we could contend against such a procedure, which has become so common in this modern world, particularly as it developed, during the World War period, is by some method of spreading the truth abroad until people develop confidence in the fact that we are stating the truth.

The problem then is how that is to be done. There are different methods. The USIS is one method. Broadcasting is one method. The exchange of students and intellectuals and so on is another method, but all of them are very important to us as a people, and very, very important to the State Department in connection with our foreign policy.

I should say they are important to Congress, which has acted in a very generous manner toward the people of many countries and the world, and what it has done is little understood by those people who were the recipients.

I might say here, Mr. Chairman, that I would suggest that it would be a good thing to bring Mr. McNutt, our Ambassador to the Philippines, who just came back from Asia and Europe generally, and who was impressed with the great lack of knowledge and the seriousness of the misunderstandings of people generally as to just what the United States has done and what its intentions were.

It is very hard for us here at home to comprehend the degree to which our actions and purposes are not comprehended and the degree to which they are misrepresented.

I do not think any nation in the world has ever been more generous than the United States and I am rather inclined to think that no nation has ever received so little credit for that generosity.

However, that is our own fault, in my opinion. We have means to correct it and this law, if I understand it, is the authorization along that line. So long as propaganda is engaged in, we will be confronted by the necessity of taking some action ourselves.

I would be unalterably opposed to our following an ordinary propaganda procedure. I do not think it would be acceptable to the Congress and I am quite certain it would not be acceptable to the people and in line with our traditional thought on what is the right thing to do.

We cannot accept a negative attitude. And it cannot be, if it is to be successful, a hit-or-miss program.

Mr. Speaker, that is what these four distinguished Americans had to say on this subject. Whom can we better afford to rely upon than them?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I hope that none of you will become unduly agitated or alarmed over this legislation. So far as I am able to ascertain, I doubt if any foreign country is going to sever

relations with us if this bill fails to pass. This is not quite as serious as some would have you believe.

I am sure you enjoyed the remarks of my good friend and distinguished colleague from Georgia who just preceded me. He is always very persuasive, but today I thought he was laboring under some difficulty, which was no doubt obvious to you also. I just do not think his heart was in this assignment of defending the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there is considerable controversy over whether or not the United States Government should engage in the business of disseminating propaganda. I do not have the time to enter into that discussion with you this morning. Let us assume that in order to keep pace with some of the other nations we must engage in a propaganda campaign. Even then the present program cannot be justified. However, I have never been able to convince myself that we should copy the methods of other countries, or that we should now set up a propaganda agency in order to convince European nations we are their friends.

The idea of the Government operating a news agency is certainly most novel and extraordinary. Mr. Kent Cooper, executive director of the Associated Press, in criticizing this program, said, and I quote:

Abhorrence of the Government going into the news business has been so ingrained into our national character that to legalize it is like amending the Constitution.

The American Government, by entering the world-wide propaganda contest, is becoming involved in a vicious circle, in which some countries are carrying on news propaganda with some of the money they have obtained through American financial credits.

I cannot understand why any further proof of our friendship for European nations should be required. Hundreds of thousands of our finest young men have spilled their blood on the battlefields of Europe and thousands have lost their lives on European soil. The United States spent about \$330,000,000,000 to win the last war. Since the war ended we have poured something like \$12,000,000,000 more into the different European countries. Still there are those who contend that we must have a propaganda agency to convince those people that we are their friends and that we are really interested in their welfare.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. With the United States pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into the various countries of Europe to finance their experiments in socialism, does not it seem a bit stupid after spending millions to urge that we are devoted to the principle of free enterprise? They are going to judge us by the money we are spending and not by our talks on the radio.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the things that disturbs me is that it seems as if we are going to import professors from behind the iron curtain to try to tell the students of America what a great country that is. I think it is dangerous.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield briefly.

Mr. DONDERO. This program would be just about as useful to America as Robert Toombs of Georgia was to Jefferson Davis when he was in his cabinet and as Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania was to Abraham Lincoln during the War Between the States. They injured rather than advanced their respective causes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a moment about the present program of the Office of International Information conducted by the Honorable William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State. It happens that I am chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments charged with the responsibility of investigating expenditures in the State Department. I am not speaking now in my capacity as chairman of that committee, but merely as a Member of the House. Our committee has not completed its work. My observations are purely my own and I speak for no other member of the committee. However, I have formed some rather definite impressions about the manner in which money is being spent in the State Department. If you will look at the list of officials and branches of the State Department, as contained in the Congressional Directory, I am sure you will be surprised to note how rapidly these officers and agencies in the Department have multiplied.

It is quite a task, I assure you, to investigate the present expenditures in the State Department. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the State Department has grown since 1939 from a total of 5,421 employees at a cost of \$17,122,000 to a total of 24,561 at a cost of \$181,535,000. It is very apparent that this expansion of the State Department is abnormal, and that some reorganization is absolutely necessary.

The gentleman from Georgia has referred to General Marshall. All of us have the highest respect for General Marshall. However, General Marshall knows very little, in my opinion, of what is actually going on in the State Department. He has not had and does not now have the time for details. He was in Moscow, you recall, for a couple of months, and has been back just a short time. It is physically impossible for the Secretary of State, regardless of who he may be, to personally supervise the different activities of that Department. He must rely on what others tell him.

I have come to the conclusion, after Mr. Benton appeared before our committee for a couple of days, that he is spending too much money on this cultural program. I refer particularly to the broadcasts in foreign languages. I have had a committee investigator check these activities in the New York office.

From his reports I am convinced this program is too extravagant and could be carried on with much greater efficiency and economy.

Recently you heard my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Brown] discuss the pictures that were sent abroad and which were described as works of art. These pictures were sent to Europe as samples of American art. I am sure all of you were disgusted with what you saw. Congress would be in an indefensible position if such projects are authorized by any bill we pass in this House. With reference to broadcasting, I think Mr. Benton has something like 600 people in New York, most of whom are engaged in the broadcasting program. I do not believe that such a staff is necessary. However, we have no assurance that there will be any retrenchment in case this bill is passed.

I am not satisfied that a propaganda agency should be established in the State Department. I raised this question when the Foreign Affairs Committee was before the Committee on Rules in support of this bill. I feel that the State Department should and does furnish information on the United States in every part of the world. I am confident that our ambassadors and ministers and everyone connected with our foreign offices are doing all that they can in their official capacities to see that essential information on our country is being supplied to all who make inquiry. I make a distinction between information and propaganda. We have always furnished information through the proper officers in the foreign service, but we are now considering the proposal to supplement information with propaganda. I believe they should be kept separate.

I wish to give you the observations of Dr. Ben M. Cherrington, of Denver, on this situation. I might state that Dr. Cherrington established the first Division of Cultural Relations in the State Department in 1939. He is now director of the Social Science Foundation of the University of Denver. He says:

As one who has been fairly close to the Department of State's activities in this field, may I say that I believe it important that the Department be authorized to conduct information services throughout the world, as well as to participate in international cultural activities.

However, I am strongly convinced that it will be a grave error to combine these two functions. They are essentially different. Information is an instrument of the Department of State whereby our policy and program are disseminated abroad. Cultural cooperation, on the other hand, should be characterized by reciprocity and mutuality of interest. There should be no imposition by one nation of its culture on another people. Furthermore, a program of cultural cooperation should arise in the educational, scientific, and cultural institutions of the country. It has been our American tradition to divorce these activities from the Federal Government, in favor of their development under the auspices of State and local governments and private enterprise. A cultural-relations program appropriate to our American tradition, therefore, should stem from the educational, scientific, and cultural agencies of the country, the chief function of the Department of State being to stimulate, facilitate, and coordinate it.

I submit that Dr. Cherrington advances a most logical argument why information and propaganda should not be confused. Personally, I think it is beneath the dignity of our great State Department to engage in propaganda. They should confine their activities to handing out information. If it is wise and necessary for the United States to enter the propaganda field then that agency should be established in some other department of our Government. These two functions should not be combined under the direction of one man in the State Department, as proposed in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the bill in its present form should not pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CHARLES HALLECK: A GREAT LEADER

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans of Indiana are understandably proud of the outstanding record which is being made by a distinguished Hoosier son, CHARLES A. HALLECK, as majority leader of the House of Representatives. They are pleased and gratified—but not at all surprised—at the vision and ability he has demonstrated in his new position of national leadership, and of his unfaltering devotion to the objectives and ideals of the Republican Party.

This feeling of pride in the accomplishments of a noted Indiana son is doubly felt by those of us who have had the privilege of working in Congress side by side with the majority leaders for many years.

When CHARLES A. HALLECK first came to Congress in 1935 from the Second Indiana District he served as the lone Republican Member of the Hoosier delegation. The Halleck record in Congress helped to turn the tide in Indiana in 1938 and the Republican delegation from Indiana has since grown to nine House and two Senate Members.

Last Wednesday night at the Hotel Statler in Washington our delegation held another of its regular meetings with H. C. Springer, chairman, and other officials of the Indiana Republican State Committee. Also in attendance was our national chairman and former House colleague, B. Carroll Reece.

During the meeting a statement was unanimously adopted, praising the national leadership of Mr. HALLECK and the splendid record of Gov. Ralph F. Gates and the Republican administration in Indiana.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include this statement in the RECORD:

We, the Indiana Republican Representatives in the United States Congress, are here in another friendly gathering at Washington in recognition of the services extended to us by an able State organization and a capable

government at home, marked by competence of officials and sincerity of legislation.

Meantime we in Washington have had before us the national problem. We know that it has been well administered for the majority of the people of America.

The Congress of the United States has entrusted the majority leadership of the House of Representatives to our colleague and fellow Indianian, CHARLES A. HALLECK, Congressman of the Second Indiana District. His leadership has been second in its success to none in the history of our party or of our Nation. It has contributed to the passage by the Congress of a party program broad in scope, liberal in concept and effect, sound in economics, and beneficial to all the people of the Nation.

The leadership of our party in both House and Senate, where we are ably represented by Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART and WILLIAM E. JENNER, has demonstrated for all Americans the capacity of the Republican Party to govern wisely and well, through the untrammelled voice of the people expressed by their servants.

This leadership has strengthened our hands in republicanism not only in the Congress and in the State of Indiana but throughout the great Republic we love and serve.

We are deeply grateful to the events which gave us this leadership. We are proud of the performance of our party in the Congress under this patriotic and statesmanlike guidance. We welcome this opportunity presented today to congratulate the people of this great representative Republic, the adherents of the political faith of Lincoln, and the true lovers of freedom for men throughout this land, and upon the service performed in their behalf by those who are our leaders.

ROBERT A. GRANT,
GEORGE W. GILLIE,
FOREST A. HARNESSE,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
GERALD W. LANDIS,
EDWARD A. MITCHELL,
EARL WILSON,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
Members of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak about H. R. 3342, referred to as the Voice of America, but I am going to speak for 5 minutes and bring to you the voice of 10,000,000 veterans who are interested in some legislation which I have had before this Congress since January 3.

On January 3, I introduced a bill to make the terminal-leave bonds redeemable in cash. I could not get any action out of the committee on said bill; and on March 4 I filed a petition on the Speaker's desk to bring the bill before the House for consideration, but, unfortunately, for some reason, that petition has only about 101 names attached to it. I wonder what is causing the delay in getting action on this legislation?

I want to quote to you from the speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] when he was just a mere minority leader. Look at the fine language he used when we adopted

the conference report on July 31, 1946, as shown on page 10588 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

I want to serve notice that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. If the officers could have cash, then there is no reason on earth why the private soldiers should not be treated the same. After all, it is the good old private and noncom who carried the greater burdens of war. I believe, whatever we do today, this fight will continue. If we do not give fair, equal treatment today, why, then, the next Congress will see the injustice corrected. Eventually, the American people will see that fair play prevails.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress, the then minority leader said "the next Congress will see the injustice corrected"; and now that he is not a mere minority leader, but the powerful Speaker of the House of Representatives, as such Speaker, I appeal to him to demonstrate to the Congress that he meant what he said when he had little power, and that he urge the majority to pass legislation whereby terminal-leave bonds shall be redeemable in cash, or legislation providing that the bonds shall be negotiable.

Is there anything unfair or unjust in H. R. 3, which I introduced on January 3, 1947? However, there appears to have developed some objection to H. R. 3 on groundless fears that it might disturb the cash position of the Treasury or interfere with the balancing of the budget. Whereupon, on May 19, in order to do away with the above groundless fears and objections, I introduced a very simple bill, known as H. R. 3521, providing that the terminal-leave bonds shall be negotiable in the same manner and to the same extent as negotiable instruments payable to bearer, but no person in possession of such a bond shall be considered to be a holder for valuable consideration unless he took it in consideration of the payment of an amount not less than the sum of the principal of such bond plus the interest accrued on such bond to the last day of the month in which the bond was delivered to him.

I believe that I have talked to a majority of the membership of this Congress and I have yet to find one who has any objection to this bill, H. R. 3521, but I am unable to get the bill out for consideration by the House. But where is it lodged? It is still lodged in the committee without any affirmative action being taken thereon, and no report either favorable or unfavorable has been made to the House.

Let me say to this fine man in the chair—and I respect him—he is a fine leader and is a fine organizer and he together with the majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration and who has shown his fairness in leadership, together with the majority whip the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. AHRENDS], who also is a constructive leader, if they would just give a whisper in favor of consideration of this legislation, I am sure that the veteran holding terminal-leave bonds would soon be able to get some cash instead of waiting for a period of 5 years.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I remind the gentleman from Florida that our distinguished Speaker used the word "eventually." I hope that eventually it may be done.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes; eventually, but he said "this Congress" as I have read, and I call upon him now, because here is a bill that nobody can object to. It is a bill simply to make these bonds negotiable, and nothing else. It will call for no appropriation out of the Treasury, it will not affect your efforts to reach a balanced budget. It does nothing under God's sun except to give these boys the right to use these bonds. There is not another bondholder of the Government who cannot use his bonds today to get cash. You can get cash on the Treasury bonds; you can get cash on the E bonds; you can get cash on the F bonds; you can get cash on the G bonds; and such bond holders have cashed more than \$15,000,000,000 worth of them since their issuance, yet the veteran who needs his money cannot use his bonds to get cash. And Congress is still sitting here doing nothing.

No appropriation is necessary. The only thing that is necessary is to make them negotiable, and nothing else.

Can you find one man who is against it? I have not found a man who has said he is against it, yet I cannot get any action on this legislation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. COX. I should like to say to the gentleman that while I have not signed his petition to discharge my committee that is in line and consistent with my record in such matters. I, of course, could not be expected to move to discharge my committee, which has never seen the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. There is a rule of the House that says that when a bill has been before a committee for 30 days it shall be in order to file a petition to discharge the committee from further consideration in order that the House might consider the legislation, and I filed the petition so that each Member of the House might have an opportunity to sign same so that the House could pass on the merits of the measure, and it is up to each Member as to whether or not he signs the petition.

Mr. COX. I may say to the gentleman that I see no objection to his bill, and I will vote for it if I have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I certainly hope the gentleman will help me to give him an opportunity to vote for one of these bills, as I believe he will take pride in so doing.

During the war we all wanted quick action from our soldiers—to get the job done—and it would have been sheer folly to have handed a soldier a bomb that would not explode for 5 years. Now that they have done this job 10,000,000 veterans want quick action from us; they don't want a bond that cannot be cashed for 5 years. I appeal to you to help pass this legislation so that the boys can get their cash. They got action with

bombs; now let us give them action on the bonds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been opposed to the State Department's broadcasting program or propaganda program ever since it was started, because I have felt very conscientiously that it was doing more harm than good. I still feel that the broadcasting program is in the same hands that it has been for some time and that it will continue to be. I was delighted when the appropriation covering it was thrown out of the appropriation bill on a point of order.

The program we have before us now would make that expenditure in order.

In an argument we listened to today we were told that America had only one thing to sell to the world. That one thing was the American way of life. Well, personally, I do not want to sell the American way of life to the world, because always when I have sold something I lost possession of it. That is exactly what we are going to do in our program in this instance. We are going to lose possession of our American way of life in trying to foster it all over the world. That is my attitude; therefore, I am opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

SHOULD BE NO OPPOSITION TO FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if the membership of the House were aware of all the distinguished leaders of science and letters, of business and the professions, and of public service who have endorsed and urged the passage of this bill to authorize by law a foreign information program in the State Department, and if they fully realized at what disadvantage our own businessmen are placed for lack of an effective program of this kind, there would be no effective opposition.

Certainly there is no one here who would have the audacity to insinuate that either Gen. George C. Marshall, the Secretary of State, or the Honorable James Byrnes, or the Honorable Cordell Hull, or the Honorable Sumner Welles is lacking in patriotism or devotion to our country, or has the slightest tinge of pink in his outlook; yet these outstanding Americans are in the very forefront of the advocates of this bill.

The heads of the principal radio broadcasting and manufacturing companies joined in a single statement in its support.

Professional radio leaders, writers, editors, executives, businessmen, industrialists, labor leaders, religious leaders, women's clubs, educators, publicists, high naval and military officers—in short, responsible citizens from every walk of life—have raised their voices severally and jointly in behalf of the program and of this legislation.

GALAXY OF BIG NAMES

Space does permit me to present even a representative roster of the galaxy of big names who have advocated such a program. I select these few names at random merely to suggest the wide range of enthusiasm the project has evoked: Philip Reed, chairman of General Electric; George Schuster, president, Barnard College; George Zook, president, American Council on Education; William Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting Co.; B. M. McKelway, editor, Washington Star; Gardner Cowles, Jr., publisher and radio owner; William Batt, president of SKF Industries; Albert Warner, commentator and news editor for MBS; John Collyer, president, Goodrich Rubber Co.; Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corp.; Palmer Hoyt, publisher, Denver Post; Ben Moreel, president, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.; Fleet Adm. C. W. Nimitz; Gen. Omar N. Bradley; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower; Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman.

Newspapers and magazines are almost unanimous in their editorial endorsement of the program; and the exceptions are in themselves endorsements.

ALL ARE PATRIOTIC

Surely there is not one of these hundreds of individuals and organizations and publications not as devoted to our country and its ideals as the few gentlemen here on this floor who, blinded with prejudice and with minds closed to every new idea, have misrepresented all that has been said here, and who in season and out seek to prejudice the minds of the people against all progress.

Unfortunately, it is always easy for a few able men with strong voices to create antagonism against deserving legislation if the proposals represent any departure from tradition.

NOTHING TO FEAR FROM ADVERTISING OUR WAY OF LIFE

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to fear from making known to the whole world our way of life. We have nothing to lose by familiarizing all the people, everywhere, with our institutions, our wonderful country, our cities, and our farms and our factories. We can gain much.

We should make known the superiority of those things we produce or manufacture, which we must continue to produce and manufacture and sell abroad if we are to remain prosperous and dispose of our surpluses. We now possess the facilities for production of vastly more than we can consume; and the whole world is hungry for a portion of our production. I believe this legislation is a major step in the right direction.

WHAT IS FOREIGN?

Mr. Speaker, I regret profoundly that some mention has been made on this floor, in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, or "foreign-sounding names," with some insinuations against the loyalty of people with such names.

Mr. Speaker, what is "foreign"?

I would remind the gentleman that in the Continental armies which fought that this country, with its blessings of liberty, freedom, and rich natural resources might be born, there were Poles,

Germans, Dutch, English, French, Scotch, Irish, Welsh, Danes, Swiss, Italians, Catholic, Protestant, infidel, Jew, Negro, Indian; why even the Friends of William Penn's colony upheld the torch of freedom!

In every war in which this country has been engaged people with "foreign" names have distinguished themselves with valor and glory.

There has just been delivered to us the two volumes of combat-connected casualties in the Navy in World War II.

I beg of the gentlemen study the names listed there—the names of Americans who died gloriously that this country, that this democracy, might live.

Here is our own State of Illinois. Let me read from the "A's" on the very first page: Abbott, Abel, Abrahamson, Abt, Abts, Acoc, Adami, Adams, Adamson, Aden, Agrimonti, Ahlstrom, Albietz, Aldrich, Alexander, Allabaugh, Allan, Allison, Allsop, Almanza, Althamar, Altmann, Amato.

What is foreign, Mr. Speaker?

Let me go on, not taking the names in order, but at random from succeeding pages: Bacha, Beaudry, Cadwallader, Christopoulos, Dworniczek, Erickson, Farni, Ghent, Gluba, Haas, Jones, Laszewski, Makucas, MacDougall, McGonigal, Mytys, Nalazek, Palouyan, Pappas, Riordan, Rios, Quan, Radke, Schmitt, Smith, Sajtár, Stein, Steinberg, St. Germain, Straus, Swanson, Torres, Van Buren, Weber, Zabinski.

THEY DIED FOR THIS COUNTRY

Mr. Speaker, what is foreign?

Those boys died for us, for our country, and our free institutions.

Whether their grandfathers came from Maine or the Ukraine; from Oregon or County Cork; from Georgia, U. S. A.; or Georgia, U. S. S. R., life was equally sweet to all of them.

Loyalty to this country is not measured in terms of surnames, or of religious affiliation, or national derivation.

And in war and in peace, the immigrant has built this country, made this country, won this country, preserved this country, whether he came on the Mayflower or the Queen Mary; whether he spoke English or Chinese, Gaelic or Slavic, German or Arabian.

THEY CREATED WEALTH

Anyone who has studied the glorious history of this, the greatest country in the world, knows that the immigrants have created wealth out of nature's bounty, and that they have served their country well.

Here are some more names, the names of immigrants who have made vast contributions to American science, industry, arts: Andrew Carnegie, Samuel Slater, John Jacob Astor, Michael Cudahy, Frank Assman, Joseph Bulova, David Sarnoff, William S. Knudsen, Ole Evinrude, Lucas Petrou Kyrides, John Garand, John A. Roebling, Simon Baruch, Joseph Pulitzer—you know their names, and a thousand more.

Other anonymous millions built the railroads, rolled the steel, dug the ore, broke the plains, felled the timber, tilled

the fields of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and corn.

What is "foreign"?

LET US HAVE FAITH IN AMERICA

Let us have faith in our country, in the unending solidity of this splendid structure of popular representative government so nobly fashioned by the founding fathers.

Are we ashamed now that this country was born in revolution?

George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Ben Franklin, James Madison, Gouverneur Morris—they had faith in the people. They built so well that this Government has endured without change from its inception 170 years ago, longer than that of any other great power.

Shall we then falter in our faith?

No, Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to fear from a few misguided men if we continue to maintain our democratic system.

If valid criticisms are made, then they serve us well, for we can correct the faults; and if they criticize and ridicule what we know is right, then their words fall on barren soil. There is no other system of free government that can compete or compare with the American system. The few students who come over here under authority of this legislation will return to their homelands missionaries for our way of life; and our students abroad will find that no other people have achieved what Americans have achieved in comfort, in freedom, and in equality.

UNFOUNDED ACCUSATIONS UN-AMERICAN

We are not experts at everything. We cannot produce everything.

We have received from across the seas many capable, patriotic men and women who have contributed greatly to America, and who have served her well. It is due to them as much, if not more, as to the descendants of the earliest settlers that this has become the greatest country in the world. The dream of freedom is common to all men; and America is the tangible form of that dream everywhere.

Let us desist from these unworthy insinuations against the loyalty of other Americans just because of the spelling of a name.

Such unfounded accusations are unfair, undemocratic, and un-American. Certainly I disagree here most strongly with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but shall I question their loyalty to this country we both serve to the best of our ability and according to our lights?

BUT SOME LEAN TO FOREIGN IDEAS

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot extend that tolerance to a few who constantly criticize and assail every progressive proposal, and who seem to feel that the Nazi system, or the government of the Russian czars, is a better way of life than the American way. Theirs too often are the voices which shout "un-American" when they should be shouting "Hurrah!"

There are those who seem deeply sympathetic to our defeated enemies who forced upon us, to defend our way of life, a ghastly war which cost us 300,000 dead, almost a million casualties, and created a staggering public debt of \$270,-

000,000,000 which cannot be paid off for generations yet to come.

They seem to feel that the czarist regime in Russia, or the corrupt Hapsburg empire of Austro-Hungary, or the imperial Fascist Italy of Mussolini, or the oriental despotism of the Christian-killing Turks, or the infamous horrors of Hitler's nazism, or the bloody rule of Franco in Spain, are preferable to the free American way.

Perhaps they think only of the moment, when they see in Europe that the Bulgars, the Poles, the Czechs, the Slavs, the Rumanians, and other small nationalities are about to attain the freedom and independence for which they have dreamed and schemed for centuries; and, because these men have lost or never had that dream of freedom, they see only the violence, the temporary orientation of Russia which seems to promise them protection of their freedom.

SHOULD STUDY AMERICANISM

These discordant souls should study the history of America. They should read the inspired words of Thomas Jefferson. They should realize that the liberal and humanitarian principles of our constitutional democracy made possible the sharing of our freedom with all.

For my part, I am opposed to all isms.

I believe sincerely that fascism is a greater threat to America than communism, but I oppose both with equal vigor.

Since the sixteenth century, people have come to this country to escape not only want and misery and physical degradation, but religious persecution and political and intellectual repression. Here the horizons are wider. Let us, Mr. Speaker, keep them that way.

There is no room for nazi-fascism; there is no room for communism.

Let democracy continue as it has, always growing, always becoming better, and we need not fear the future.

COMPLIMENTS COMMITTEE

I desire to offer to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which unanimously reported this bill favorably to the House, my sincere personal congratulations and compliments on the way they have discharged their duties and their obligations to our great country.

I am sure that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who presented the report, and other distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will have ample opportunity to explain the bill in full detail, and satisfy the membership that there is nothing to be feared, for every practicable safeguard has been set up to prevent deterioration of the program.

I know, too, that gentlemen of the House and the Nation at large have full confidence in the Secretary of State, General Marshall, who will have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the program; in Mr. William Benton, who rose from midwestern farm boy to head an advertising agency so successful that he could retire from business and devote himself to public service at an age when most Americans have yet to make their first million, and who, God knows, does not bear any fearsome foreign-sounding name; and in Mr. J. Edgar

Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who will be responsible for screening out from the personnel any individuals who might have a thought not approved by some of the ultratriotic gentlemen who have spoken here today in opposition to the bill.

In these hands, and in the language of the act, we can all feel secure, and know that in every way the rights and interests of our country have been fully protected.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday by virtually unanimous vote the House appropriated \$5,280,000,000 for the War Department. Along with the rest of you I supported that measure, because along with the rest of you I believe we have got to have a strong defense system; that we have got to be prepared for the contingency of war; that it is essential we remain strong and secure as a nation. I call attention to the fact, however, that with no opposition \$5,280,000,000 was appropriated because of the chaotic, and uncertain, and disturbing conditions prevailing in the world today.

We come before you this afternoon asking you to authorize an appropriation which, if the State Department got every dime it asked, would be \$31,000,000. It is not going to get every dime of that. We know that the Committee on Appropriations is going to reduce the request considerably. They may give \$20,000,000, they may give \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000, but I call attention to the contrast in figures. We are asking for this comparatively paltry sum and this authorization so that the Congress at long last can do something constructive to win the peace, to prepare for peace, to give the peace department of this Government a little money and a little authority and a little equipment for once as we so rightfully give it to the War Department.

I am appalled at some of the arguments I have heard today, because I cannot reconcile them with the attitudes I know prevail in the hearts of men who made them and who want peace and who want the American concept to spread. I call attention to the fact that the Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, has said that if this battle for peace is going to have a chance to win, he needs this kind of legislation. And, every Assistant Secretary of State in the Department has said the same. General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, has said that if his preparedness to maintain the security of America is to work effectively, he wants this type of program enacted into law. General Bedell Smith, our Ambassador in the most troublesome spot in the world today, our Ambassador to Moscow, came back from Moscow to plead for this kind of legislation, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs reports it to you unanimously. Every responsible authority this country has that is charged with the heavy duties of protecting America and of promoting and preserving the peace is a strong support of H. R. 3342 and the program it would set in motion.

The costs of this program are, at the outside, \$30,000,000. Compare that, if you please, with the \$12,000,000,000 we have already authorized since the war to be spent overseas to achieve the objectives that all the advisers this Government has in the field of security and peace tell us they cannot well achieve without this legislation and without this program.

Now let us get the picture clear. I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] in saying I think the Committee on Appropriations rendered a service to Congress by refusing to appropriate the money in bulk fund and by knocking out the present so-called cultural program on a point of order, because now we have before you comprehensive, clear-cut legislation, with at least 20 congressional controls over this program which have never existed before. In the course of the general debate and in the course of the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule we are going to explain those controls and safeguards to you one by one.

We are not asking you to continue as it is the program now functioning. We are asking you to establish a new office and a new program with new guide lines and new safeguards and new controls, with authority completely in the hands of Congress, and we ask you to appropriate for it what you think is wise after the authorization is made.

At this time I ask you only to be good enough to hear the arguments, to grant the rule, to give us a chance to tell you why all of the men of the Government at the top levels charged with defending us in times of war and protecting the peace have joined the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in urging you to enact this new program for winning the peace.

THE DOCTRINE OF RECIPROCITY

Let me point out just one or two of the safeguards. We are going to discuss them in detail when we get into general debate. This legislation does something which I know most of the Members of this House want to have achieved. On page 3, if you will look at the bill, the so-called Mundt bill writes into the legislative language of Congress for the first time in American history the doctrine of reciprocity insofar as our interchange and contact with foreign nations is concerned. It provides that this program will operate only with those countries engaging in reciprocal arrangements with us. Let me say to those who fear that a Russian or two is going to come to America that we now have in this country 3,669 Russians inspecting America, looking at our plants, and going to school. None of them came in because the OIC is in operation. None of them came in under the Voice of America program. They came in despite the program. They will continue to come in unless H. R. 3342 becomes a law. They came in because the law of the land today has nothing against their coming in with visitors' visas. They came in under visitors' visas, as citizens of one country have a right to visit another under existing international arrangements of

comity. But this legislation will make a change in that, because the Russians have permitted us to send only 250 Americans over there, and this writes into law the principle of reciprocity. Those that want to do something about getting our arrangements with Russia on a realistic, reciprocal basis vote against their own convictions and their creed if they vote against this legislation, because it writes into law the doctrine of reciprocity for the first time in American history.

Let me say a word about the professors who might come over to this country from Russia or some other Communist country. This legislation provides that if any visitor from any country under this program is over here engaging in activities not consistent with the security of the United States or of a political nature, the machinery of deportation shall be brought against him promptly and completely—an additional safeguard, completely new, and novel, in American history. It is a new safeguard in the interest of security, in the interest of peace, and in the interest of reciprocity, the only firm foundation upon which nations can live as friends and endure under peaceful conditions.

To those who say that in the employment of this particular agency there are some who are unfit for the job, and I presume that is true, let me say that we have set down an arrangement for screening everyone of them by the FBI. Everyone now employed and everyone who might be employed is to be screened by the FBI, and the check is complete. It is in fact as comprehensive and as detailed as the check we made against the men working on the Manhattan project developing the atom bomb during the war. There is not a Chinaman's chance that a Communist or a Fascist or any un-American can work his way into the employment of this division of the Government under the restrictive legislation written into this act. This legislation makes certain that the Voice of America will at all times be a truly sturdy American voice.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Is it not true that a great many other countries under this plan besides Russia are involved in this interchange of information?

Mr. MUNDT. Russia is going to be considered as being directly reached by but a very small portion of the program. The magazine America, of which we are going to tell you later, deals with Russia. This program deals largely with those areas of the earth where it is so important for us to maintain friendly contacts if America is going to have the friends it needs in these disturbing times. I hope you will now vote for this rule so that Congress can have the opportunity to consider this important peace program on its true merits.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear in the first place, continuing about where I left off while talking on the rule, that in asking you to support H. R. 3342 we are not asking you to perpetuate a program nor are we asking you to experiment on uncharted seas on which we have had no experience. Regardless of what happens on this question today, the OIC expires on July 1. If you do nothing at all, the only thing that takes the place of the experimental program which has been carried on in sending information from America throughout the world will be some locked desks, some empty offices, and dust accumulating on some old files.

We are asking you to enact this legislation establishing a new office—the Office of Information and Educational Exchange—to engage in a new program to be financed by new appropriations specifically named and which activity will be staffed in large part by new personnel because every present employee in the OIC on the 1st day of June received his termination notice because that office expires on July 1 and everybody will have to be reappointed or find employment in a new position.

In my opinion, it would be tragic to muffle the Voice of America either by slashing its jugular vein through denying the appropriations required to conduct a United States information service abroad or by darkening the beacon light of American freedom which now shines brightly in some areas and just manages to filter through into others but which all the world today recognizes as the last and best great hope of all mankind to perpetuate the peace and promote sound justice and good will. H. R. 3342 provides the machinery and the methods for projecting the voice and spirit of America not only by short-wave radio but by the printed word, the use of information centers abroad, the friendly visit of invited technicians and by other methods. It also sets up procedures whereby students, scholars, and serious observers from abroad can visit America and learn about our formula of freedom here in the greatest successful laboratory of freedom, tolerance, and self-government the world has ever known. Mr. Speaker, all

of us talk about peace but H. R. 3342 sets in motion the minds and actions of men to do something about creating the only sort of environment in which peace can flourish and endure.

This is not a question to be decided by differences between so-called isolationists and internationalists. It is a choice between adopting a policy for America which embraces either incapacitation or initiative as the device by which we hope to exert our leadership in this postwar world and by which we expect to get across to questioning people in every foreign land the real truth about American concepts, American ideals, and American objectives.

Certainly if we gag our own voice, strait-jacket our own hands and feet, and place blinders on our own eyes, our hope of leading the world to peace and away from atomic annihilation is indeed both dim and dreary. It is because I am convinced the vast majority of the Members of Congress of every party, from every section of the country, and of every variety of thinking from the standpoint of what they consider proper and appropriate American foreign policy believe and must agree that whatever our policy and wherever and however we build for a secure tomorrow we must in this supersonic age of travel and communication keep the rest of the world advised of our purposes and our program that I have labored so long and so hard to bring H. R. 3342 before you in a form and language which I dare to hope will win your overwhelming support.

By the most conservative estimates we are already committed to spend or have spent nearly 12 billions of American dollars abroad since the end of the war. What is the purpose of these vast expenditures? We all know the answer—it was spent, whether wisely or wrongly and whether poorly or well, because all Americans desire this hard-won peace to endure. What a commentary it would be on the judgment and prudence of this Congress were we to refuse to dedicate, let us say, one-fourth of 1 percent of what we are already pledged to send overseas for the just and noble purpose of making positive that the people and the places which receive this American aid know that it comes from a friendly America, that they know why it comes, and that they know something about the peace-loving, unselfish, non-aggressive, good Samaritans who comprise America and who ask in return for their billions only that world order be restored and world peace sustained. Unless there is no merit at all in the economic axiom that "it pays to advertise," this program is one which we cannot afford to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Information and Educational Exchange will operate to win friends and influence people abroad. Its objective is to make friends for Uncle Sam and to win converts away from the war-god Mars. It is an adventure in good will. For less than one-fourth the cost of a single modern battleship we propose through this program to try just once in the long, bloody history of war-torn relations between countries to give truth and understanding, and friendly feelings an oppor-

tunity to help put an end to the continuing wars which have brought civilization to the abyss of an atom-bomb-accumulating armistice. Suppose we fail—the most we can lose by trying is less than the cost of 30 seconds of the type of war we are trying to avert and which up to now has never been averted by any of the traditional, customary, and proverbial methods men have tried.

Mr. Chairman, against a mobilized world public opinion that knows what it wants and has plans how to get it, there is no power or purpose which can be arrayed successfully. The great objective and the end goal of the program I am today proposing is to do its full part in helping to plant and to nourish the thoughts and ideals in the hearts and minds of common people everywhere which will marshal such informed opinion into effective channels for preserving the peace.

Over the long pull, sir, if peace is to prevail it is essential that the hatreds, the greeds, the selfishness, the avarice, the distrust, the misunderstandings, the suspicions, and the false concepts of all humanity must be toned down and controlled by self-restraints and general enlightenment. Men and women everywhere must come to know for themselves those things which are basically sound and fundamentally true if right is to conquer might and if war is not to recur.

Let us remember that the coin of peace has two sides. It has its material as well as its spiritual side. When battalions of men meet across boundary lines, war is the result. H. R. 3342 sets up a procedure for bringing about the meeting of minds across boundary lines in the pursuit of peace and the mutual understandings upon which peace can be built enduringly. We plan to utilize the free flow of ideas and culture across boundary lines which will enrich the life of everyone. We plan to exchange scholars and students, textbooks and techniques, periodicals and programs, to the end that children throughout the world may come to be taught the virtues of showing consideration for others and the vices of bigoted and bludgeoning types of state worship.

This program has no special creed to espouse save peace, justice, and tolerance. It is an American program to induce others through reciprocal means to cooperate in promoting good order and good will. It recognizes no monarch greater than the Prince of Peace. It gives the common people who fight all of the wars an opportunity to learn the truths and practice the concepts which will avoid future wars. It provides a people's foyer leading to the temple of permanent peace.

We ask you to appropriate about one-fourth as much as it costs to build a single battleship, to try something new in the field of international relations; to try something different in what up to now has been an ineffectual record in trying to perpetuate world peace. We ask you to join us in an effort to marshal public opinion around the world for peace, and to eliminate misunderstandings, suspicions, doubts, and skepticisms which have held men apart. We ask you

to do that by joining us in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Is this legislation to make possible berths for those who have already been in this type of work?

Mr. MUNDT. No. Very definitely it is not.

Mr. SHAFER. As I understand it, others who come in now under your bill must all be screened.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. In fact, those presently employed who may be reappointed must also be screened by the FBI.

As I have said, this is not a program to be abhorred by isolationists and to be acclaimed by internationalists, whatever those outworn terms may mean or imply. The rapid march of world events during and since the war have outmoded such distinctions and have invalidated most of the arguments used by either group to substantiate its reasoning. The question we face today is not whether we should attempt to isolate ourselves in an atomic era of supersonic planes and jet-propelled weapons in which vast oceans and whole continents have become of less consequence in self-defense than was formerly true of a single river or a mountain chain. The question we must face up to now is whether the great United States should incapacitate itself by denying to ourselves weapons of information and communication which all other important nations are now utilizing with accelerating speed and significance.

Surely he who today preaches a doctrine of incapacitation for America goes far beyond those who in the era of the twenties and thirties, and up to Pearl Harbor, were classified as isolationists. At least those who would have isolated America from the wars abroad wanted to keep America strong at home and were generally found in support of great defensive military establishments. However the super-duper stay-at-homes of today who embrace the doctrine of incapacitation for America through opposing a program of informational and educational exchange make pikers out of yesteryear's so-called isolationists by comparison. These incapacitators would disarm America of its weapons for defense and offense in the significant era of world opinion at the very juncture of history when the fate of all humanity rests upon the development of sound world opinion and the recognition of sane concepts and peaceful purposes by the Nations and the peoples of the earth. Isolationists had the merit of wanting to keep America out of war. Incapacitators surely can claim slight merit for desiring to keep America out of the peace.

If we incapacitate ourselves by disqualifying ourselves as effective leaders in the world by eliminating our contacts abroad, how are we going to maintain peace? How are we going to resist and offset the propaganda coming out of poisonous mouths in many parts of the world, maligning and slandering America and misrepresenting us? If we deny ourselves the right of rebuttal; if we deny

ourselves access, through equipment and means, to the hearts and minds and eyes and ears of the world, how are other countries to learn the truth about America? If we refuse to tell the American story ourselves, who will replace us on the air waves and on the printed pages of the world?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will not this service arm and sustain the people in those foreign countries who are making the fight for recovery and the great fight for democracy?

Mr. MUNDT. Absolutely. There is no one so completely under the heel of a dictatorship but what there still burns a little flame of freedom somewhere in his country. Back in the hills and in the little huts there are people in every land dreaming of the day when they can be free. This gives them something to hope for. It gives them some idea of what they dream about in the darkness of their dictatorial oppression. It provides a sense of reality that what they hope and pray for may some day come to pass in their own areas of the world.

No man ever gets so rich that he can afford to lose a friend. No nation ever becomes so powerful that it can afford to ignore what other countries think about it, whether they be big or small, civilized or uncivilized. Good will means something to a country in time of peace; and sometimes, as was demonstrated in the north Africa campaign, it may mean the difference between defeat and victory in time of war. So I think that over the long pull, if we are going to have peace, it is essential that we provide the mechanism and machinery whereby we can promote those points of view and points of contact which are favorable to us.

We have provided over 20 safeguards in the Mundt bill, not only against infiltration of un-American individuals into the organization which is to be created, but safeguards protecting the economy of America; safeguards providing that Congress be kept informed of what is going on; safeguards providing for guidance and counsel and advice from the private professions and industry to help the State Department develop the best possible type of program; safeguards precluding the employment of aliens except in those areas where Americans are unable to speak the dialect being broadcast; safeguards so that the Voice of America will be spoken by Americans and the spirit of America will be interpreted by loyal American citizens who are enthusiastic, sincere, and able exponents and disciples of our cherished ways of life.

We have included safeguards providing that wherever possible the State Department must use private agencies in order to carry out the program; safeguards so that Congress by concurrent resolution can stop the program or any portion of it any time it chooses without a Presidential signature, because we want the Congress and the country to feel secure and convinced that this is a program of Americans broadcasting the voice

of America in a manner in which all Americans can be proud.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I know the gentleman has given a great deal of time to the preparation of the bill but there is one thing I think ought to be explained to the committee and that is the present channels that we have in the air. If we should not pass this legislation or do something so as to retain those channels we lose them. I wish the gentleman would explain to the committee that if those channels are once given up through lack of use at the end of this month we have lost them never to get them back; they are gone forever and we could not do the thing we are trying to do here. We must retain those channels.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is precisely correct. Under the international allocations of short wave channels, when you cease to use your channel your rights are lost. It is very similar to the land situation in my State in the old days when people established squatters' rights. Squatters would move in there and as long as they lived on a quarter section and defied the elements, if they lived there long enough the land became theirs. But if they moved off for a while they lost their squatters' rights, somebody else moved in and they never could get their rights restored. So it is with these wave lengths. If we do not use them, if we let them go even for a little while they are lost to us forever and some other country will appropriate them to broadcast their propaganda against us. Unless we adopt this legislation we lose our squatters' rights on the highly valuable wave lengths now assigned to us.

Mr. BLOOM. Some other country will move right in and take those wave lengths over and we have lost them forever.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. What has been done in this bill with regard to reciprocity?

Mr. MUNDT. I explained that at the beginning of my remarks. I know the gentleman was called from the Chamber by a telephone call and might not have been here when I touched on it, and I did so rather hurriedly.

In this bill for the first time in legislative history, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, there is a formula for reciprocity. Briefly, if concessions are not granted us we do not grant them to such countries over here. It is in the bill and it seems to me it is a tremendously significant safeguard, it is a great step forward, it is an affirmative declaration. It is not a policy which antagonizes anybody but it is a fundamental policy which would be made clear by my bill and which would work with equity for all concerned.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am delighted to yield to the ranking minority member of my subcommittee who has given invaluable help in the perfecting of this legislation.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that another good safeguard is contained in the bill to the effect that the policy may be terminated by Congress itself at any time? I do not know whether the gentleman mentioned that or not.

Mr. MUNDT. I mentioned it but I may have skipped over it rather hastily. In order, however, to make this remain a congressional activity under complete congressional control at all times, we put in a specific proviso that the whole program or any portion of it can be repealed by concurrent resolution of Congress. We retain the right to exercise our own judgment in maintaining control of the legislation and in evaluating its effectiveness.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL CONTROLS OVER NEW PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, before concluding I want to call attention specifically to the 20 definite and complete congressional controls which H. R. 3342 set up to direct and govern the activities of this new office and the new and expanded program which this legislation authorizes it to undertake. Nothing is further from the fact than to make the careless and unsupported statement that H. R. 3342 proposes simply to continue in existence a prevailing program or to project a present policy into permanency. H. R. 3342 does nothing of the kind, Mr. Chairman. H. R. 3342 is new legislation. It is specific, clear-cut, comprehensive, and it establishes controls and safeguards never before found in any American program of information service abroad, whether it be that operated in the Western Hemisphere alone under the office of the Inter-American Coordinator or whether it be that of the OWI during the war, the psychological-warfare program of the War Department, or the OIC which temporarily took over some of the operations of the Office of War Information during the postwar era but which office is being definitely and completely terminated on June 30 this year, regardless of the outcome of this legislation.

Let me give you the facts from the printed record and I hope you will supplement this information by reading the comprehensive volume of hearings which we held on H. R. 3342 and the committee report which accompanies it. Here, however, by specific, definite reference to page, section, and line are the new safeguards by which Congress will direct the activities of this new program and by which Congress will keep it constantly under its control and supervision.

No. 1. On page 3, section 201, line 15, you will find set forth in unmistakably clear language the doctrine of reciprocity governing our international relations and activities. I have discussed this previously in this address so I shall not elaborate upon it further now.

No. 2. On the same page, page 3, starting on line 21, you will observe that we require the Secretary of State to turn over for deportation any foreign visitor who abuses the privileges he enjoys un-

der his visitor's visa by engaging in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States. May I add, Mr. Chairman, that since visitors are now in the United States and will always be here whether we enact H. R. 3342 or not, this is a highly significant new safeguard since it gives the Secretary of State authority and instructions which will not only stop any existing un-American activities or the part of foreign visitors but which will make certain under the exchange program we propose to establish there shall be no abuses of this type. This safeguard is specific, stern, and clear.

No. 3. On page 4, section 203, line 19, we provide that no assistance under this act shall be furnished of any character not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States. Mr. Chairman, here once again we write into law the clear conviction of Congress that this shall be an American program, projecting American concepts, and conforming with American ideals.

No. 4. Page 9, line 4: Here we make clear that nothing in this act shall authorize the extension of services and advice to foreign countries relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government. You see, Mr. Chairman, throughout this legislation we retain the fundamental purpose of this program. This is a peace bill, sir, and not in any sense a war measure or a military proposition.

No. 5. On page 8, section 403, line 12, we specify that the Secretary of State shall encourage the performance of the services proposed under this legislation by private American individuals and agencies. Only where private enterprise is unable or unwilling to function is it contemplated the information and educational exchange program established under H. R. 3342 shall be handled by the Government itself.

No. 6. Again on page 8, section 403, line 16, we provide that the services abroad rendered by a Government agency shall be advisory, investigative, or instructional in character for purposes of demonstration and not in competition with private enterprise.

No. 7. Still on page 8, section 403, line 20, we make even clearer that such services abroad shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of such construction. It is our purpose to aid private engineers and private American enterprises to secure business connections and contracts abroad and not in any way to interfere with private enterprise. That we have been successful in doing this is clearly apparent from the fact that the Committee on International Relations of the Engineers Joint Council has enthusiastically recommended passage of this bill. The testimony of their spokesmen is found on page 178 of the printed hearings available to each of you.

No. 8. Page 9, line 8, we specify that services by our Government to foreign countries shall not be undertaken if such services will impair the fulfillment of

domestic responsibilities of any Government agency. In other words, we clearly recognize and stipulate that the primary function of an American Government agency is to handle the needs and requirements of Americans first.

No. 9. Page 9, line 12. Here we stipulate clearly that this is to be no great haven of bureaucracy and no starry-eyed adventure by impractical idealists or theorists. Here it is provided that the Department of State shall invite in outstanding leaders—please note the language is mandatory—in the various fields of activity covered by this act to review and extend advice on the policies in each of the various categories concerned.

No. 10. Page 11, section 502, line 7: We have made it crystal clear in the language of this so-called Mundt bill that this program will not establish competitive Government radio and press agencies to compete with private American enterprise. Note the language of this specific congressional directive:

The Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate.

Mr. Chairman, the Office of Information and Educational Exchange as proposed by H. R. 3342 will become the only Government agency in the United States operating under a congressional mandate to work itself out of a job as soon as possible.

No. 11. Page 11, line 15: Here we stipulate directly that this act shall not be construed in any way to give the Government a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs or a monopoly in any other medium of information. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to observe here that all seven of the short-wave licensees in the United States are in favor of this program and that well over 80 percent of the editorial opinion of this country has also been expressed in support of it.

No. 12. Page 11, line 17: We provide specifically here that the State Department shall—again please note this is a directive not a suggestion—invite in outstanding private leaders in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities. We have proposed, sir, to mobilize in this great crusade to win and preserve the peace the best brains and capacities of America both in and out of Government in every field of endeavor and pursuit incorporated in this legislation.

No. 13. Page 11, still in section 502, near the bottom of this page, please, on line 21: To make double certain and completely positive that there shall be no competition by the Government against private enterprise we stipulate that all films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall be identified as to Government source when they are so projected.

No. 14. Page 14, line 4: Again to make positive that this becomes truly the voice of America we stipulate that the employment of aliens shall be sharply limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available. These will be very few in number but where they are required their services become invaluable.

No. 15. Page 16, section 703, starting on line 21: To prevent this operation from becoming a sprawling bureaucratic office and to safeguard the American taxpayer we specify that the maximum use must be made of existing Government property and facilities where Government property or services are required to be used under this act. Thus where embassy property abroad can be used, it will be; where existing offices can be used at home, that is required. Small as are the outside expenditures to be made by this operation, we have set up safeguards that they all be used economically and efficiently.

No. 16. Page 18, section 901, starting on line 14: This is the now famous loyalty check on all personnel to be used in this program. It requires that all people employed or assigned to duties under this act must first be screened and certified as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have discussed this earlier in this speech so I shall not amplify upon this safeguard further now. It is the complete answer, however, to those who worry as all of us rightfully should lest un-American influences creep into this or any other division of the State Department. You can be sure before the FBI certifies as to their loyalty the people in this division will be completely and adequately investigated and examined.

No. 17. Page 19, section 904, line 20: This safeguard provides that nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by other law of the United States such as in the case of atomic developments, for example, or where it is inconsistent with the security of the United States. Since the War Department is to be represented on the Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee advising the Secretary of State on the conduct of this program this provides a full and effective safeguard concerning our military secrets as well as upon other developments which might better not be disclosed.

No. 18. Page 20, section 906, line 18: Once again to make definite and clear the mandate of Congress we here provide that it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State—need I add, sir, that any Cabinet officer can be impeached for a violation of duty—that insofar as is practicable the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise, must be utilized in carrying out the provisions of this act. By bringing in here the element of contractual arrangements we specifically provide the avenue and agency for utilizing a wide field of private agencies in implementing the program set up in H. R. 3342.

No. 19. Page 21, section 908, beginning on line 6: To retain the full control of this program in the hands of Congress—and whom, may I ask, are we to trust if we cannot trust ourselves?—we provide that the authority of this act or any provision of it shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. Since such a termination procedure does not require the signature of the President it means that a simple majority of the Congress can terminate this program in whole or in part at any time it so desires or at any time it finds or feels that the program is neither effective nor efficient. Seldom has legislation been written which carries a more direct and decisive safeguard.

No. 20. Page 21, section 909, which is the final section of the act and which begins on line 11: Here we provide that the Secretary of State must submit to Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under the authority of H. R. 3342. In addition we must appropriate the money specifically for every activity under the act at the beginning of each fiscal year. Thus we will be kept fully and currently informed and advised as to what is being done and we can and will govern ourselves accordingly when the annual appropriation bills come before Congress. The Congress and the country will be kept advised concerning the achievements and the operations of this program. By this device the full force of public opinion and congressional authority becomes one final safeguard to make certain the United States Office of Information and Educational Exchange is being wisely and effectively operated on a broad program to help preserve the peace and to maintain a climate of public opinion everywhere which will be conducive to the attitudes and understandings which are essential if war is to be permanently averted.

Mr. Chairman, in one way or another I have worked on and toward this legislation since early in 1943, when I introduced my first bill on this general theme. We have won a great war at colossal cost in life and limb and fortune. Can we now win the peace? If so, can we hold it secure and make it permanent? Talk and good intentions and negative attitudes alone will neither outwit nor outlast communism, and they will never outlaw war. We must do something affirmative and positive and American if this last great bastion of freedom in all the world is not to succumb to the stresses, the strains, and the seductions of our day and time. Through the program outlined in detail in H. R. 3342 we establish a mechanism and authorize the machinery for waging a crusade for peace. Its cost is less than insignificant as compared with just 1 year's preparedness for war, to say nothing of just 1 day's participation in the type of conflict which next will come if we fail in our efforts for peace. Surely it is worth the trial. We Americans have led the world in education, in production, in government, in our standards of living, and in our standards of justice. Now, if ever,

we have a chance to lead the world toward a way of life and a type of understanding which will win and sustain the peace. H. R. 3342 can be our first big definite self-sustained step in that direction. It is a start up the trail leading to an objective which all Americans hold dear—that of eternal peace.

Do some of you say this is impossible? Do some argue it is not worth ten or twenty or thirty million dollars a year to try? Are there faint-hearted among you who believe this challenge is too great to attempt? Because it has never been done must we believe it can never be? Is there any good reason not to start that which has already been too long delayed? I urge you to be citizens of great faith. Certainly an era which can produce the jet-propelled plane, the death ray, and the atom bomb can conquer the problem of the boundary line. Are we to let imaginary lines scrawled by mere man across the face of the earth hold us back from conquering what at most is but a mental attitude in an age when we are actually conquering the space between the planets?

Mr. Chairman, we dare not fail to try every reasonable expedient to preserve the peace. No man can say that anything which promotes mutual understanding and cements friendships is not a deterrent to war. And, sir, unless all of human history is a fictitious mockery it stands unchallenged and unchallengeable that anything which eradicates misunderstandings and erases skepticisms helps create the environment in which friendship and prevailing understandings thrive. Today, all I ask you to do is to make the effort.

I ask you to have courage and confidence and conviction enough to try something different to help avert war and to help promote peace. I ask you to try this not as a substitute for anything—it is not proposed in lieu of armies or navies or soldiers or bombs or the United Nations—it is proposed as something additional, as a supplement to what we are already doing which if it succeeds can win for every country the security which no country in the history of the world has up to now enjoyed. I urge you to enlist in this ethical echelon in the battle for peace not in the terms of what it might cost to conduct the campaign but in the tragic terms of what it might cost if we fail in our over-all efforts to make this peace a permanent thing. I urge your support for H. R. 3342.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have been impressed in recent weeks and months with the general agreement among the American people, and also within the Congress itself that there is need for such a program as is proposed in this bill.

A good many people have expressed doubt about the way this program has

been or will be conducted. Some Members of Congress have criticized some of the personnel connected with the undertaking. So I wish to confine my remarks right now to that phase of the question.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the loyalty of these people must be unquestioned because they are the voice of America, they operate the conduit through which that voice is to be made felt throughout the world. There is no question about that. I think we all agree on that.

I believe every Member of the House will agree that we are fortunate in having in charge of the State Department at this time one of the great Americans of all time. Someone said a minute ago: "Well, General Marshall is a great man, his loyalty is unquestioned, but he cannot look after everything in his Department." Why, of course, he cannot. When General Marshall was Chief of Staff he could not personally lead the Normandy invasion and he did not, but he selected a good man to do it and he gave that man over-all supervision to perform that operation. General Eisenhower, who was our leader in the European theater, could not personally conduct all of the operations in connection with the Battle of the Bulge, but he selected a good man to command there and he kept in close touch with the operation and with the conduct of that battle.

Anyone who knows General Marshall intimately knows that when it comes to the selection of good men to work under him he is an expert, and they also know that he does not hesitate to fire any man he believes cannot fill the bill. Someone has said: "You will have a personnel man down there under General Marshall." You have. The Assistant Secretary of State in charge of administration is General Marshall's right-hand man. His name is John Peurifoy.

Let me tell you about John Peurifoy. I have known him many years, and his family all of my life. He is from South Carolina. His forebears came to this country 150 years before the American Revolution and their descendants have served this country faithfully, as leaders, in war and in peace, ever since. There is no question, there can be none, of John Peurifoy's loyalty, character, and outstanding ability.

Let me tell you what John Peurifoy did, General Marshall's personal appointee, the first thing after he went into this job. He called up the FBI and said: "I want you to investigate me. I have a tough job to do and to do it well my loyalty to our Government must be above suspicion. I want you to investigate me and everybody down here."

And in passing may I say that since General Marshall was appointed Secretary of State he has himself requested of the Attorney General that top priority be given to the investigation of the loyalty, patriotism, and Americanism of every employee in the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill goes a little too far in one respect.

I am going to vote for the bill, but I voted for an amendment in the committee, and I am going to offer that amend-

ment here, to make what I consider a fairer bill. This bill goes a long way. It says that the Secretary of State can employ no one under this program until the Federal Bureau of Investigation has investigated him as to his loyalty. That is all right. I am for that. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a fact-finding agency. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has peculiar facilities to find facts about anything or anybody. But, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not a quasi judicial agency, and I am against the provision requiring that the FBI certify an applicant before the Secretary of State can employ him. I think the bill as written is a reflection on the Secretary of State though not intended to be.

If we cannot have more confidence in the Secretary of State, whether he is a Democrat or Republican, this Government is in a pretty bad way. It is my purpose at the proper time to offer an amendment to correct this situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think that I share with the gentleman the high degree of admiration that every Member of the Congress has for General Marshall, and I think we applaud the committee in its care with which they are going to scrutinize the selection of people who work on this program. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman's remarks as well as the remarks made by the gentleman from South Dakota. There is one thing that still puzzles me and which has not been touched upon. Who listens to the Voice of America? What information does the committee have before it that would indicate to the House what people of what countries to which these broadcasts are beamed actually hear the programs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

In reply to my distinguished friend, I would say that people all over the world are listening to the Voice of America. The Department gets 25,000 letters a week about the program from abroad. It costs 30 cents apiece to mail them from foreign countries all over the world. That is evidence in itself that foreign peoples are listening to the Voice of America. And we have unlimited other evidence, and I hope we will have time to present some of it to the Members today. But I wanted to return to this matter of personnel because it has been harped on so much.

There is one man who has been identified with this undertaking, pilloried by some, and I think very unjustly, William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State. He has been in charge of this program for 20 months.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am very much pleased that the gentleman should take the time to express his confidence in Mr. Benton, who heads this activity in the State De-

partment. I should like to say that I know Mr. Benton. I do not believe there is anybody in the entire country that approaches him in the qualifications needed for this particular work. I believe he is the best man that could possibly be found.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not want to yield any more.

Mr. Benton has shown himself to be an unselfish, patriotic, progressive, outstanding, and loyal American citizen. He has done a wonderful job in this thing. Some people in this Congress and some people in the country have intimated that it might be necessary to throw Mr. William Benton to the wolves in order to get the opposition to accept this program but I for one am not willing to throw him to the wolves, because he has made America Voice-of-America conscious. He is the one who has constantly dinned it into Americans that even during peacetime we have a battle on our hands, that we must get across the American viewpoint to the other people of the world in order that they may get a true picture of the kind of people we are, what we believe in, and what we stand for.

Bill Benton does not need this job; he took it only to render service to his country. He was a successful businessman long before he was selected to put across the Voice of America; and he has really put it across whether you like all of his methods or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Allen, Ill.	Gorski	Muhlenberg
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Nodar
Angell	Granger	O'Toole
Barden	Hale	Owens
Beall	Hall	Patterson
Bell	Edwin Arthur	Pfeiffer
Bland	Hall	Philbin
Boykin	Leonard W.	Plumley
Brown, Ohio	Harless, Ariz.	Powell
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Rabin
Bulwinkle	Hart	Rayfield
Burleson	Hartley	Reeves
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Rich
Byrnes, Wis.	Hendricks	Riley
Celler	Hess	Rooney
Chadwick	Hoeven	Ross
Chapman	Holmes	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	St. George
Clements	Jones, N. C.	Sarbacher
Clevenger	Jones, Wash.	Scott, Hardle
Clippinger	Kefauver	Scott,
Cole, Kans.	Kelley	Hugh D., Jr.
Combs	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Sheppard
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Short
Dawson, Utah	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Delaney	Lemke	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Lesinski	Stigler
Doughton	Love	Stockman
Douglas	McCormack	Sundstrom
Elston	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Fallon	Macy	Tollefson
Fellows	Mahon	Van Zandt
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Fuller	Meade, Ky.	Weichel
Gallagher	Meade, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Gamble	Miller, Md.	Worley
Gifford	Morrison	Youngblood

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3342, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 312 Members responded to their names—a quorum—and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying when the point of order was made, there are certain factors that have made the American people conscious of the worth of a program like this. I mentioned Mr. Benton's great work, the general confidence in the Secretary of State, and a few other factors. But I think the conversion of the American people to the need of a program like this is due, more than anything else, to the present-day policy of Russia. General Marshall has testified that we are being lied about and maligned throughout the world by certain nations antagonistic to our form of government and our way of life. The worst view of our life is being shown to other peoples in the hope that they will lose confidence in our system and that the totalitarian system will be exalted. We must combat it. We must realize the importance of this great dynamic force, air waves and radio.

Many nations have used it during the last 10 or 15 years, in war and in peace. Hitler softened up his intended victims by propaganda programs sent through the air, not truths such as we want to tell about America but a gilded view of the kind of government dictators intended to foist upon the world. Japan used it to soften up her enemies in the Far East. Mussolini used it in his Mediterranean conquests. Russia is using it. We do not know how much Russia is spending on a program like this but we do know that it has been testified by people who should know that they are spending more than all the other nations of the world combined. England is spending forty or fifty million dollars to give the people of the world her conception of a proper kind of democratic government and democratic life. It would be folly for this great American Nation, dedicated to liberty and justice, to refuse to defend itself by the spoken word.

May I say here that everyone on the Committee on Foreign Affairs is convinced of the worth of this program. It is not a partisan program. The foreign policy of the United States is nonpartisan. This is an American program, and I believe it is entitled to your support.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I trust that the gentleman will enlarge on the question I asked the preceding speaker, about what people in what countries hear the Voice of America. That has not yet been developed.

Mr. JUDD. One of the other members of the committee, I believe, will deal with that. I want to approach it from a little different angle.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman from South Carolina said that Hitler and Mussolini used this program. I simply hope the gentleman will explain that the same thing will not happen to us that happened to them by using the program.

Mr. JUDD. The program that we intend to use is totally different from that which Hitler and Mussolini used. Their purpose was to bewilder and mislead peoples to soften them up and extend control over them by a series of lies and incessant repetition of the lies. If we were to try to outdo the Nazis in lying, to misrepresent rather than accurately present America it would, of course, be utterly indefensible and contemptible. I would not vote 1 cent of the taxpayers' money for any such purpose. Fortunately we do not have to go out and lie about America. What we have to do is to present the truth. But we have to do it repeatedly and effectively.

When I see the magnificent job of salesmanship the Fascists and the Nazis and the Communists have done for such rotten products, I am ashamed that we, with such a good product, have on the whole done such a poor job of salesmanship, have been so almost apologetic about the system of government that has given a better life to its citizens than any other in history.

I want to devote my remarks at this time in the general debate to a discussion, insofar as I am capable of it, of the basic philosophy underlying this proposal, and also of the contention made several times today, that if we have a good product it will sell itself, that we do not need to tell the story to the people of other countries.

If a person can get two bars of soap and can try out both of them, he will choose the product he finds is the better. But hundreds of millions of people today are not in a position to sample for themselves what life is like under our American flag, under freedom. They have to depend on the reports that come to them, and the other side is giving them distorted reports 24 hours a day. If people hear only lies that are big enough and told often enough, how can they escape being confused?

I submit it is not a tenable position to argue that just because we have a better system, of course, everybody in the world knows it. The fact remains that a lot of people in the world do not know it.

A friend of mine just came home from a visit to south China. He was born out there. He knows the language. He went to his native place in the interior where he was brought up as a boy and where he knew the people and they knew him. He sent me some of the questions that the people asked him: "Is it true that the Americans have turned over the occupation of Japan to Russia? Is it true that all American forces have been withdrawn from Japan leaving the running of the country to the Japanese? Is it true that

American troops in China number 100,000?"

He said that some Chinese told him they had heard we had up to 3,000,000 troops there when actually we have less than 10,000.

"Is it true that American troops murder, rape, and maim an average of one Chinese every day?"

Of course it is impossible to have troops in any country without some mishaps, even crimes. Every one of them can be built up all out of proportion by an enemy of our way of life.

My friend was asked: "Is it true that the new Sino-American commercial treaty makes China a vassal of America?"

In that new treaty, China made some concessions and we made some concessions. Yet only the report of the concessions that China made goes out in Communist propaganda, and America is portrayed as a cruel imperialistic nation forcing her will on weaker nations. They know America was not like that in the past, but after the Yalta betrayal, it is understandable that their confidence in us can be shaken by such propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for us to have a good product. We have to present it. Our good deed is not enough if they do not know about it. Or the deed may be interpreted as having ulterior motives if we do not take the trouble to explain why we did it.

Something which, if done to us, would mean to us that the individual or nation which did it is our friend, may perhaps be interpreted by those with a totally different background and set of values, as indicating that the doer is an enemy.

Until the Teheran and Yalta Conferences the United States had come as near to living by the Golden Rule in its international relations as any nation in history. But sometimes I wonder if we really understand the Golden Rule. We read it and interpret it just as it is ordinarily written: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. That is adequate when we are dealing with people having the same background and set of values as ourselves; but when we are dealing with people of a totally different background, then we have to understand its true meaning which is: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you—if you were they. That is a very different thing.

Often we have not taken the trouble to project ourselves in our imagination over into their way of thinking, so we can see ourselves and our deeds as they see them. But only as we do that can we present our way of life—how we got the way we are and why—in such a way that they understand us and what we do.

Our forefathers came to this country in the beginning because they had an idea, a vision, which they were unable to work out in Europe. They came here to plant and develop that idea—human freedom and political equality. They had two wide oceans between them and the rest of the world. Then the steam engine was invented and they put it into boats to make steamships, which destroyed the oceans as barriers. Then we invented the airplane, the rocket, and ultimately the atomic bomb. Thus with

our own inventions we ate up the cake of our physical separation from the rest of the world, but still, nostalgically, thought we had it.

Sometimes I wish we had a planet all by ourselves. But I know that being Americans we would not be happy if we had such a planet. We would lie awake at night on that planet thinking up some way to get over to this planet and start doing business with it.

Surely Pearl Harbor proved that no matter how much we may want to ignore the rest of the world, the rest of the world is not going to ignore us. Now, if it is not going to ignore us and we have to deal with it, then we want to deal with it in such ways as to promote the security and prosperity and well-being of the United States.

There are four main means by which we can deal with the rest of the world, four measures by which we can try to influence favorably the thinking, ideas, and attitudes of the people around the world.

First, by diplomatic measures—the strength and skill of our diplomacy.

Second, by military measures—the strength of our military organization and the skill with which we handle it at the right times.

Third, by our economic and financial measures—the strength of our economy and the skill with which we handle our economic relations with the rest of the world.

Fourth, by ideological measures—the strength and attractiveness of our ideas and the skill with which we present them. This, of course, does not take the place of and cannot do the work of the other three, but it is an important part of the total scope of our contacts with the rest of the world, and it can greatly assist the other three.

More and more countries are spending more and more money each year on this means of trying to influence other nations and peoples. France is spending on propaganda abroad 30 percent of her total foreign office budget. If we were to do as much in the ideological field as France, we would have to spend almost a third of the total appropriations for our State Department.

Russia is spending more on it than any other nation. Why? Because her rulers know what one man, Karl Marx, did with an idea, and what Lenin and Stalin have done with that idea. They saw what Hitler did with an idea. They know what the Pilgrims, when they came to this country over 300 years ago, did with an idea.

The great heroes in Russia today are not industrial magnates or scientists; they are not the great generals. The heroes in Russia today, and the highest paid persons in the land, are the skillful users of words, those who know how to take an idea and, whether true or false, present it in an attractive, convincing form. They have learned it is their most potent and effective weapon throughout the world. Surely we have learned it is their most dangerous weapon. And yet some are saying it is needless and useless for us to do anything at all in this particular field of activity.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to give the Russians credit for doing an extraordinarily skillful job in presenting their ideas to the rest of the world. For example, at San Francisco, at Moscow, at London, at Paris, at Lake Success, one of their delegates at least three times a week gets up and makes a speech in which he launches attacks on us for lynchings in America, our alleged imperialism in China or Korea, what we allegedly are doing in the islands of the Pacific, or the Middle East, or Latin America, our so-called dollar imperialism and so on. They keep the world's attention so focused on the alleged evils—and some of them are there—of our western civilization that millions of people all over the world, including the United States, fail to note, or at least to appreciate fully, the fact that Russia herself is forcing on all her neighbors as cruel and ruthless and utterly despotic an imperialism as any the world has ever known.

It was gratifying to read last fall that one day in the assembly of the United Nations, after the Russian delegate had got through with his usual denunciation of American "imperialism," Mrs. Roosevelt got up and said, "Just because you say it every day does not make it true." Well, if it takes so long for Americans to see through the humbug—and many Americans are still taken in by it—what can you expect of persons in the interior of Europe or Asia, who have little or no background of knowledge by which to judge all the charges and lies; no standard by which to measure the propaganda against us. The testimony is overwhelming that it is increasingly effective. Are we not to make an effort to present the truth, to say nothing of an effort to correct the untruths?

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in this field, because I spent the best 10 years of my life in this business of trying to spread ideas. I was a missionary in China. Some spread ideas by speaking or preaching. You long ago discovered that that was not the way for me to go about it. Some did it by teaching, and it is a good way.

Some did it through agricultural and industrial work, giving people better crops and tools, more food and better living conditions as the means of proclaiming and demonstrating their Christian faith.

It was through medical work, bringing to people better physical and mental and I hope spiritual health that I tried to spread the ideas I believe are the most important truths in the world.

The great Teacher said, "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

I believe that—believe that the truth and the truth alone will make men free. But how can it make men free if they do not know it? And how can they know the truth if they do not hear it? And how can they hear it if nobody tells it?

Mr. Chairman, there can be no question as to the need for the activities proposed in this bill—their importance in the world-wide struggle between freedom and slavery. What we must now determine is whether the measures au-

thorized are the best way to meet the need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I think that the passage of this bill is of vital importance to this country in spreading the truth and nothing but the truth to all of the other countries in the world.

This bill is not aimed only at the dissemination of information into Russia. That, of course, is a part of the whole world picture, and I think it is tremendously important if we are going to continue to send relief abroad and to appropriate huge sums of money for that purpose, and to appropriate something like \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. At the same time we ought to tell the people throughout the world just what America is, just what we stand for, just what we intend to do.

I do not believe in the window or show type of propaganda. I believe that the best type of propaganda is to tell the truth; and, as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has just stated, the truth will make you free.

I have been somewhat disturbed in the consideration of this bill by statements both direct and indirect made against the director of this particular branch of the State Department. Attacking a governmental activity by attacking its leader is, of course, nothing new in politics, and it has become a familiar technique; but I feel that we are extremely fortunate to have such an individual as Bill Benton as director of this particular program in view of the fact that he has a splendid business background to back up what he has already accomplished. I wish to refer the membership of this House to a statement which appeared in the Washington Post of May 17, 1947, and which can be found on pages 198 and 199 of the hearings, a statement signed by such individuals as Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corp.; Mr. Ralph E. Flanders, a Member of the other body; Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Pictures Association; by Will D. Fuller, president of the Curtis Publishing Co.; and by Miriam B. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co. These gentlemen are men who know Mr. Benton very well. They are individuals who have worked with him in private business and they tell us in no uncertain terms of their confidence in his ability. For the benefit of the membership of the House I wish to quote a few lines from the article which appeared in the Post of that date. They said:

We are five of the men who have worked most closely with Bill Benton in various civic activities. The kind of criticism that is now being leveled at Bill Benton is the kind of thing that keeps responsible and able people from going into Government work.

I might interpolate to say there that despite the fact that Mr. Benton has been charged with being an associate of Mr. Chester Bowles, that as a matter of fact there had been no connection between

these two people for over 12 years. In 1935 Mr. Benton left the firm of Benton and Bowles, went to the University of Chicago where he served as vice president, and from that position he was asked by his Government to accept his present position in the State Department. I think also it might be well to bring out that Mr. Benton has a real American background. As a boy before the First World War he left Minnesota with his family and migrated to Montana where he helped to prove up on a dry land homestead. I think that indicates quite clearly the type of individual with whom we have to work, an individual who believes primarily in the efficacy and worthwhileness of private enterprise, a man who has come into the Government at a loss as far as he is concerned financially, and a man who has contributed of his great ability to the development of a program that is necessary for the welfare of this country.

I sometimes wonder why some men come into the Government to work, and at other times I wonder why once we get a good man he stays with us, because so many of them have had to take too much in the way of abuse from Members of Congress, and they have been in a position where they have been unable to defend themselves. I think we ought to try and be fair and impartial in considering a program of this kind.

Bill Benton is being blamed for a lot of wartime ghosts for which he was not responsible. Many Members of Congress hated the OWI, and are blaming Benton for that. Many Members of Congress did not like Nelson Rockefeller's operation in Latin America, and now they are blaming Bill Benton for that. Many Members of Congress did not like Bill Benton's predecessor, Archie MacLeish, and they blame Bill Benton for that. We are not voting on OWI today. We are not voting on Nelson Rockefeller's wartime operations. We are not voting on Archibald MacLeish. We are voting on a proposed information program in the State Department which began after the war was over.

A prominent Senator remarked recently that if Benton had come to Washington as an unknown man, and started a completely new organization, he could have made 100 times as many mistakes, and would still have only one-hundredth as much criticism. He is not criticized for his mistakes, but rather for the ghosts which preceded him.

Bill Benton in 20 months has reduced the personnel from 11,000 to 3,000. Bill Benton is trying to bring into effect a new program, to pick the best, and the highest type of personnel, and to give to the people of all the world the kind of a picture of America that we want him to give, a fair, impartial, and unbiased picture.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman should add to his very fine statement that Mr. Benton had no connection with

the OWI at any time, in any way, at any place.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

One of the things in connection with this bill has to do with the exchange of students.

EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT EXCHANGES

First. Here is the story of one student. In 1936 a man from Afghanistan came to the United States to study engineering. He obtained his degree at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and spent a year of training at Denver, in the laboratories of the Bureau of Reclamation. The man then returned to his native Afghanistan, where Japanese engineers were employed in many key government jobs. When war broke out between Japan and the United States, the Japanese were expelled by the Afghan government, and this American trained engineer was appointed Minister of Public Works. He called for American advisers. Last year this former American student gave a contract to a New York engineering company for \$16,000,000 to construct a dam in Afghanistan. The exchange of students is good business. It also has produced an important leader in a key country, bordering on the Soviet Union.

Second. The exchange of students has a measurable effect upon the political attitudes of students who study under a democratic system. Of the 19 German students who went to Oxford on Rhodes scholarships before the recent war, 15 were anti-Nazi throughout the war. My authority is a report by the Secretary of the Rhodes Trust, quoted in the London Times last December 21. There is no question that the political views of students who study abroad is greatly influenced in favor of the country which provides the education. If the United States is out to make political friends, I do not know a better way than through the exchange of students.

Mr. Chairman, some mention has been made of the use of private agencies and personnel in this particular part of the State Department. I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that for 6 years the Department of State has been placing contracts with the Institute of International Education, a nonprofit organization in New York, to supervise scholarships for foreign students.

Also for 6 years the State Department has been using the American Library Association for various tasks in the field of books and libraries. At one time the association administered the three American libraries in Latin America as a "pilot" operation in the absence of a professionally qualified administrative staff in the Department, but it gave up that responsibility in line with its stated policy of not engaging in long-term commitments for administration of such programs. The Library Association continuously consults and advises the State Department on books which are sent abroad.

The American Council on Education has been supervising the State Department's aid to American schools in Latin

America. Mr. Roy Tasco Davis, well known formerly as United States Minister in Central America and director of a private school in Maryland, has headed that work under the American Council on Education.

The State Department has given a contract for the past 3 years to Science Service, Inc., a private organization, to select and translate American scientific books into Spanish and Portuguese.

The State Department's broadcasting operations, as you know, are to a large extent carried out by private radio companies, operating under contract with the State Department. All the radio transmitters are managed by private companies, and approximately half of all broadcasting programs are prepared by private companies.

The State Department has obtained 16-millimeter educational films from more than 100 American companies and private organizations. All new motion pictures required by the State Department for distribution in foreign countries are produced by private film companies.

The practice of looking first to a private agency has been a policy of the State Department for a number of years.

Other Government agencies which participate in this program are also utilizing private services. The Department of Agriculture has utilized the services abroad of staff members of 26 of the 48 land-grant colleges.

Last year, for example, the Department of Agriculture had survey missions in three foreign countries. The mission to China was headed by Dean Hutchins, vice president of the University of California. The mission to the Arab states was headed by President Harris, Utah State Agriculture College. The mission to the Philippines was headed by Dean Call, of the University of Kansas. It is natural that the Government turns to the great agricultural colleges for help.

Of course, there will always be a residue of this information and educational work which no private agency can handle. The magazine *Amerika*, which the State Department sends to Russia, is necessarily a Government magazine because the Soviet Government does not permit the circulation in that country of private American magazines.

Also, when a foreign government asks for training in census taking, or weather forecasting, or public-health administration, it is natural that experienced personnel for such services are most likely to be found within the Government than outside because of the unique public nature of such work.

The point I want to make is that the use of private agencies is not a new policy. It is a policy already in daily use.

In conclusion, I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that we have the approval of all the private broadcasting companies and by and large the great majority of newspaper publishers and editors. They have indicated their belief in the need for a program such as this, and I sincerely hope the House will see fit to pass this measure overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted me previously, I am inserting at this point a series of articles and letters having to do with the business under discussion:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

A START TOWARD UNDERSTANDING

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—The fact that Voice of America short-wave broadcasts are now expected to continue in one form or another is as much to the credit of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as to anybody. His brief testimony on the Hill the other day on why the Voice of America should not be silenced was impressive and effective. It was simple, straightforward, and persuasive. In fact, because it was so effective and revealing, your correspondent is taking the liberty of paraphrasing the high lights of General Eisenhower's brief testimony.

I have sat with some of my fine friends in the Russian Army by the hour trying to explain to them the basis of our Government. They simply cannot understand such things as our idea of a free press, one that can publish what it pleases, coupled, of course, with responsibility for the truthfulness of its reporting. They simply say: "If you were real friends of ours, you would not allow such and such a thing to go out."

There is nothing has a right to be in these broadcasts but fact and truth. If you do not stick to fact, soon you will become aware of disbeliefs. It will recoil on you and defeat you if you try to get slick about this thing. It must be true.

These programs must be persistent and be put out by persons who know what will appeal to the audiences they are trying to reach. There is no use talking academic principles to someone thinking in terms of food, clothing, and what you get for your day's work. We don't realize that in Russia people are living six and seven in a room; that they let out space by the cubic meter and not by the room. It should impress them to know that here a man can have a cottage, a car, or a refrigerator.

When I met the Russians in Berlin, I wanted to arrange an exchange of visitors. I thought it would be a good thing. So one day I invited each other country to send 100 officers into our area to see what they wanted. The Russian member, a friend of mine, was disturbed and objected, so I said: "All right; I will withdraw your invitation." But he said: "I want an invitation."

Afterward he came to me and said he was embarrassed and had something to explain. "For 25 years," he said, "we have been surrounded by enemies. We had no friends. The result is we have trained every Russian soldier that everybody is his enemy—everybody who is not a Russian. Therefore, if I invite your men to come down as freely in my sector as you are asking mine into yours, we will have incidents. They will be shot. We will have all kinds of trouble."

For the first time I began to understand this fellow's problem. He was trying to meet on a friendly halfway basis but the teachings of his people for the past 25 years would not let him.

I do not believe the Russian people really know our atomic bomb proposals. Things like that are not disseminated in that country as in ours. For instance, we actually had Russian soldiers honestly asking us, when we met them in Vienna: "Where did the Americans get so many Russian jeeps?" You see, they operate under a different system. It is not considered necessary to tell them so many things.

Every capital in the world knows the facts about our military situation as of this minute. There is no question about it. Their military people know we are disarmed.

I think there should be reciprocity in all these things—exchange of scientists, observers, students, etc. It is a thing that establishes good faith.

I know that even when we are telling the truth we will be accused of telling lies. They will do that for a long time. But what we are trying to do is make a start in promoting a condition that will be favorable and in which the peaceful idea can grow. We cannot expect to reach these people quickly and on a very broad basis at first.

There will be disappointments, but if we stick to the truth, and use every possible means of exchanging truths with other peoples, we cannot but help add advantages to ourselves. There can be no absolute security for the United States until every nation enjoys a comparable feeling of security. All that arms can do is give you a relative feeling of security. I do not care how many guns and planes and ships you pool. Only as we get a common basis of believing in each other, do you have security. Then I can go fishing.

COMMITTEE FOR UNITED STATES

INFORMATION ABROAD.

Washington, D. C., June 2, 1947.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. MANSFIELD: The Committee for United States Information Abroad has been formed by a group of citizens who have learned from personal experience that it is important to explain ourselves to foreign countries. To quote General Eisenhower in his statement in support of the Mundt bill, we are "constantly struck by the appalling ignorance that exists throughout the world about the United States; things that we take so much for granted that we do not even think about them are completely unknown to much of the world."

We think it is vital to tell the people of the world what the people of the United States are like, how they live, what they think, what they believe. It is vital to share our knowledge with them, and bring theirs to us.

The United States policy of extending aid to free nations makes no sense unless we also export American ideas. We are convinced that if the true purposes of the United States are known and understood around the world, that we will have friends around the world. We are also convinced that if we allow any distortion of those purposes and ideals through propaganda around the world, without correction, then the responsibility for that distortion and the danger it represents, is partly ours.

The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947, H. R. 3342, known as the Mundt bill, provides the basis for continuing a constructive program, including the exchange of students, teachers, and technical persons abroad, as well as the Voice of America broadcasts.

We are well aware that there have been criticisms of part of the activities now carried on by the State Department. We think also there may be certain changes needed in the proposed legislation. Such corrections can be made without altering the purpose of the bill. It is most urgent now to take necessary steps to avoid complete disruption of the program.

We therefore strongly urge you to support this legislation, as requested by Secretary of State Marshall.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH MCGILL, Chairman.

COMMITTEE FOR UNITED STATES

INFORMATION ABROAD.

Washington, D. C., June 3, 1947.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. MANSFIELD: I have learned from some Members of Congress that some confusion exists between the Mundt bill, H. R. 3342, and an international radio broadcasting measure pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This confusion should be cleared up before the vote on the Mundt bill this week. I have made inquiries at the State Department and have obtained the following information:

On March 24 and 25 the Acting Secretary of State sent to Congress two proposed bills, both relating to broadcasting. The first measure would give to the Secretary of State general authority for conducting an international information program, including broadcasting. This proposal was redrafted and introduced by Representative MUNDT, and is now on the House Calendar. The proposed legislation being considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee concerns broadcasting alone, which it would place in a federally chartered corporation to be known as the International Broadcasting Foundation. It has not yet been introduced as a bill and no hearings have been held.

Passage of the Mundt bill will in no way prejudice the consideration at a later date of the International Broadcasting Foundation. The two bills supplement each other and both are sponsored by the Secretary of State. Also, as I understand it, the provision in H. R. 3342, which would authorize broadcasting, might still be needed if the Foundation proposal were later passed, if (as I presume everyone would concede to be necessary) the State Department would still participate in preparation of the broadcasts, at least at the policy level.

As chairman of the Committee for United States Information Abroad, I again urge you to support the Mundt bill, and to assist in correcting any misunderstanding concerning its relation to the International Radio Foundation proposal.

Sincerely,

RALPH MCGILL, Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], a very valuable member of the subcommittee working on this legislation.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, to possibly repeat a few remarks I made this morning before a very small but select audience as the House convened, I should like to say again that since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives I have heard a great many palpable misstatements and inaccuracies made on the floor regarding pending legislation. It is my very sincere opinion that more half truths, more vagaries and more prejudices have been aired in connection with the so-called Voice of America program than on any other single legislative topic. So violent and so entirely likely have been some of the allegations made that when I originally found myself appointed as a member of the subcommittee under my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I was completely predisposed against the measure and personally convinced that the material being broadcast to foreign nations was not only ill-conceived and presented with an unbelievably high degree of stupidity, but actually subversive and tending to destroy the very foundation of this country.

The initial hearings before the subcommittee served to dispel much of the confusion existing in my mind relative to what has already been done and what is presently contemplated for the future. In full justice to the critics of the program it must be admitted that some mis-

takes and errors have been made. However, it also might well be pointed out that errors, inconsistencies and faulty judgments are not completely and entirely limited to the confines of the State Department or to Mr. Secretary Benton. A careful examination of the facts might even prove that some of the opponents of this measure have not always been entirely accurate in their statements, nor have they always been infallible in their considered judgments.

In proposing a program of cultural exchange between this country and other nations we on the committee have attempted always to keep in mind one basic, fundamental thought. We have, as I said this morning, only one thing to sell to the world, and to the gentleman who said, "When you sell a thing you lose possession of it," I should like to point out that the men who first brought Christianity to the world did not lose possession of it. It grew to something bigger and finer than they had ever conceived it could or would. The men who have sold liberty and freedom in this land have not lost it. Our forefathers who sold the first doctrines of a representative government did not lose it, but we stand in danger of losing it and we stand in very serious danger today. What we conceive to be unfettered freedom of action for the individual under law is what we have to sell to the world. You can call it liberty, call it the democratic process, call it the American way, or call it anything else, it still remains the one commodity we have to vend.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NIXON. The gentleman has been discussing what America has to sell on these programs. Has the gentleman any evidence as to how successful the means of selling has been? What kind of audience has been built up for these programs?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am very grateful the gentleman has brought up this point. To digress for just a moment on that question, the public-opinion poll conducted by the War Department in the American zone of occupied Germany last year showed that 75 percent of all radios in the American zone are used for listening to the Voice of America. This was an increase of 12 percent over the preceding year.

A public-opinion poll in Budapest, Hungary, last November showed that there were 100,000 licensed radio sets. Of these, 62,000 could pick up short-wave broadcasts, and 43,000 were actually listening to the Voice of America.

The State Department last year received 60,000 letters from foreign lands relative to the Voice of America radio program. These letters made specific comment on the programs. I do not think there is any question but that the Voice of America is being listened to, and listened to most widely.

There is slight disagreement on the basic premise that this program is desirable. Few indeed are those who would claim that such a program is

unnecessary or undesirable. The basic issues have been confused, however, as is so often the case, with personalities and with questions of ability and selectivity and questions of procedure. We cannot toot upon a tin whistle in a world of percussions and brasses. We are dealing and we shall continue to deal for many years to come with a world in which every effort is being made to subjugate peoples by men who use ignorance as a weapon to defeat life and freedom and peace, by men who use hatred, bigotry, and intolerance to subjugate the minds of men. The danger we seek to avert by this program is not directed against chains upon human hands, for unfortunately most of the world today is under chains. Rather we fight against the bondage of human minds which follows as a natural result of ignorance of other people, their habits, and their respective ways of life.

We propose under the terms of this bill, H. R. 3342, to attack this ignorance on the part of others with every weapon of enlightenment on which we can lay our hands. It has been truly said that to know a man is to like him. Can we afford not to tell the world about America, about our true aspirations, our true purposes, and our prized liberties, when the press and the radio of other lands through 24 hours of every day cry out a program of hatred, falsification, vilification, and calumny?

If General Motors can spend \$15,000,000 a year to advertise automobiles, can we do less to advertise freedom of speech, press, and worship? If Procter & Gamble can spend \$21,000,000 a year to advertise bubbles and lathers, can we do less for a world nurturing a hope of freedom than to tell them about schools, churches, farms, and homes in the very cradle of liberty?

Take the magazine America. I have here one of the most recent issues. Do any of the gentlemen take exception to the content matter? Is this anything tending to undermine and destroy democracy and freedom? It tells about Abraham Lincoln, letter carriers, vacuum cleaners, electric irons, threshing machines, lawn mowers, trucks, and farms. In Russia there is a circulation of 50,000 copies of this magazine, and they are dog-eared and tattered before the last person has read them. They are passed from hand to hand until they are completely worn out. It unveils to the people of Russia a world of which they have never dreamed, a world of which they have never heard, a world in which a man is a creature of human dignity and of personal opinion and in which machines do the work done elsewhere by human backs. Can anyone imagine that this revelation could fail to have a strong, moving impact upon people whose minds have been closed to the subjects given herein? Is this un-American? Is this something which tends to destroy freedom?

The last page in the magazine is on the Declaration of American Independence, and it starts out with words like these:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and that they

are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Certainly that is not subversive and does not tend to tear down the things that we have.

Why do Communists find it necessary to reindoctrinate and reorientate soldiers of the Red Army who return to Russia? Why has it been found necessary to almost drive some of them back to a life which they once accepted with docile compliance?

Mr. Chairman, those who know attribute the defection of their loyalties to the sudden and moving discovery that outside the borders of their own land there is a world full of amazing and wonderful things, a world brought forcibly to their attention by their service during the war.

What moves a member of the Russian Embassy, working in the Russian Embassy, a Russian, to fill his brief case with secrets stolen from the Canadian Government under the very eyes of his colleagues and return them to the Canadian Government? What else but a feeling of new friendship discovered in a world he never knew existed?

That is what we are trying to take to these people.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I want to announce to the Members of the House since I notice several gentleman looking at copies of the magazine America that we have some extra copies here which contain the complete English translation which will be much more intelligible to the Members than if they merely look at the Russian language.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reference was made during the discussion of the rule today to the increase in the cost of the State Department since 1940. I believe it was about 500 percent. I can but call attention to the increase in the cost of the War and Navy Departments during that time. These increases are, by and large, of exactly the same pattern and for the same reason.

Reference was also made to the fact that this information program is a new one. That is quite true. The testimony of General Eisenhower before our committee when he was asked that direct question by me was to the effect that we in the United States, and the United States Army particularly, gained a realization of the value of such a program for the first time from the Germans during the war. Yes, it is a new program.

Now, we passed an appropriation bill here yesterday for upwards of \$5,000,000 for the War Department. The State Department has asked, as our distinguished chairman has said, for only \$31,000,000 for this program, which is infinitesimal by comparison, I repeat, even if the House should grant the entire amount.

Many of you will remember that a bill similar to this was under consideration by the Seventy-ninth Congress, practically throughout its existence. Exhaustive hearings were held by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Some members of the committee wished to improve the bill by rewriting it and amending it. That occurred, and finally the bill passed the House perhaps a year after the hearings, but too late for consideration by the Senate last year. That is the trouble now. That enabled the Appropriations Committee, very properly I think, to decline to appropriate funds for this program, because there was no authorization of law for it, it having been done heretofore under the President's war powers, I believe. We do not criticize the Appropriations Committee. They were probably right. We just hope they will continue that same policy in other bills. Practically the same bill as passed the House was reintroduced. Exhaustive hearings occurred again. The committee has amended the bill considerably, and improved it. Now, time is of the essence, because if this bill does not become law by the end of this month, the cultural relations program will necessarily discontinue for lack of funds. As has been said, the wave lengths of the Voice of America will have to be abandoned, and some other country, so many of whom are anxious for those wave lengths, will greedily grab them up. The rooms and buildings in other countries which we now have rented for libraries and for the school program will have to be abandoned, and others will rent them. Finally, the broadcasting material, very expensive material, will have to be sold or junked or abandoned.

The personnel of the department will disband and be scattered to the four winds. Of course, there are Members of this House, charming gentlemen that they are, who will contend that it would be an improvement for the personnel to disband. But no member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, no Member of the House who is thoroughly familiar with that situation, will agree with them. On the other hand, I thoroughly agree with my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in their opinion that while mistakes have naturally occurred—mistakes always occur in any such large organization as that; you and I make mistakes; I make them, and I am afraid some of you do sometimes—while mistakes have occurred, I am strongly of the opinion, in fact, I am absolutely convinced, that on the whole a great job for this country has been done under the able direction of Assistant Secretary Benton, in which I wish to congratulate him.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wish the gentleman would turn to page 9, section 404 of the bill, and tell me what that means.

Mr. JARMAN. Why, the gentleman can read the English language as well as I can. Of course the gentleman knows what that means. The gentleman ought not to ask me that. He understands that.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does that mean that this Government is going to take anyone they want to put on this program, whether a foreign citizen or not, and pay his expense of training in any college or public or private institution in this country?

Mr. JARMAN. I do not think it means that, but I will yield to the author of the bill, who can probably explain it better than I can.

Mr. MUNDT. It does not mean that at all. It provides for an exchange of students. The students pay their own expense. The State Department can reimburse the Government. That is handled specifically under terms of procedure now well-outlined and in operation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Regardless of what the gentleman says, I was not facetious at all. The last part says to provide for training for somebody making a request upon the Secretary. He makes his request to some Government agency to provide for such training from State and local agencies or private institutions and organizations, and that would be the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is taking a few words out of the context. If he will read the whole paragraph he will understand the meaning.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield for a question; but then I must decline to yield further.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I wish to ask the gentleman, a member of the committee, if the committee during its study of the bill gave consideration to the effect the bill would have upon the increase of immigration of this country if we advertise the virtues of the United States as thoroughly as the bill proposes.

Mr. JARMAN. My recollection is that no particular consideration was given by the committee to that question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the gentleman believe it will have that effect by increasing desires on the part of millions of people in Europe and other parts of the world to come to the United States?

Mr. JARMAN. It will undoubtedly have that effect.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And will that not result in inclination to pass legislation to meet that situation?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. This cannot possibly change our immigration laws as a result of these programs going abroad; there is good reason to believe people in those countries will seek with increased determination to correct their own societies

and rebuild them along the pattern of freedom they see in America.

Mr. JARMAN. And we have such confidence in this country that we do not fear those who may come here because of this advertising.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, this program is based almost entirely on the conviction that mutual understanding between the peoples of the world will serve as a firm foundation for lasting peace and that by contributing to peace it will save the taxpayers of this country a thousand, yes, I will say a millionfold of its cost.

The program contains many things which have been long-standing functions of the State Department and which have been in progress through general authority given that Department. I refer particularly to the radio news bulletin which goes to our embassies throughout the world daily, I believe, and which I so thoroughly enjoyed and by which I kept in contact with the United States in South America 3 years ago before this Division of the State Department came into being. The library program is some 12 or 15 years old. While it was possible for those programs to be carried forward by the State Department under general authority then, now that they have been brought into this Cultural Relations Division and the Congress has declined to provide funds for it, it would—I am not a lawyer—but I am afraid it would be impossible for the State Department to carry those very necessary and worthwhile functions on in the future because of the declination of the Congress to provide funds therefor.

Mr. Chairman, unless one with a contrary view appeared during the one day when I was unavoidably detained, every single witness who appeared before our committee was vigorously in favor of this legislation. They were such distinguished gentlemen as Secretary of State Marshall; Under Secretary Dean Acheson; General Eisenhower; General Bedell Smith, who was General Eisenhower's chief of staff during the war and is now our Ambassador to Russia; and Secretary of Commerce Harriman, a former Ambassador to Russia and England. Not only did all of these gentlemen vigorously urge the adoption of this legislation, but no opposing witness appeared, despite the invitation I heard extended by our able chairman through the press to anyone in the United States who wished to appear against this legislation and the assurance given by him that he would be happy to have them. Unless they appeared on that one day I was absent, no single witness appeared against the proposal.

You tell me that a program, the criticism of which has been so widely publicized as has this, particularly during the last few months, throughout the United States, you tell me that after an invitation like that, when a committee has heard testimony for many days, there would not be witnesses in opposition?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. May I say that on that one day there were no witnesses in opposition to this bill.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. I thought that was true but I wanted to be sure. You tell me that under those conditions, when no one appears, not a single person appears against the bill, that the program is all wrong? If so, I would like for you to explain to this House why that is true and why the people of the United States generally are incompetent to ascertain that fact.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman may well add a list of the distinguished witnesses that appeared in support of the bill in addition to the fact that none appeared against it. There were such great organizations as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Amvets, and others, all offering testimony in the hearings strongly endorsing this legislation. Certainly everyone is not wrong except those opposing it on the floor of the House.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman with whom I thoroughly agree. I am impressed that the main trouble, Mr. Chairman, is probably the fact that the critics of this program are disturbed because it does not embellish the situation in our country. They apparently feel that it should be made to appear more attractive than it really is; whereas we are willing for the people of other countries to see and hear it "as is." I do not indulge in the insinuation that we who favor this legislation entertain more respect for and confidence in our country than those who oppose it, but we wish this program to continue to neither embellish nor belittle it. We wish it to be a proportionate cross section of our country as it is.

Relative to the circus-lady picture, for instance, which has been so generally criticized, I call your attention to the fact that we do have circus ladies in this country who somewhat resemble this picture. While by no means an artist, I also refer to the fact that General Eisenhower considers this phase of the program very valuable. Now with reference to the broadcast about Senator Taft and Mr. Wallace, I do not believe that one who has read them and is thoroughly familiar with the conditions under which they were rendered could possibly criticize either. The whole Taft broadcast was entirely in order and not the least bit uncomplimentary to this gentleman. The Wallace broadcast went only to Germany and was not very complimentary to the Wallace family as statesmen, but highly so as raisers of corn.

I am afraid the trouble with the Voice of America in the eyes of its critics is the fact that in the words of General Marshall, "Its broadcasts do not gild, but cover the earth with truth." It is the purpose of the entire program to send not only to Russia, but throughout the world, a true cross section of what happens in these United States of ours. The fact that this seems to be so generally realized in other countries enabled

either General Marshall or General Eisenhower to say, "The people of the world believe our broadcasts."

We wish to continue to deserve this reputation and cannot do so if we color or slant the information we send them.

Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of the State Department to continue to conduct this program in such a way that the people of the world will continue to believe these broadcasts. Despite the criticism of those who think a different picture than that which really exists should be painted to the people of other countries, the State Department is not going to yield to that insistence and spread false propaganda, even though these critics believe such would benefit the United States. We members of the Foreign Affairs Committee thoroughly agree with and approve this determination.

I was surprised to hear General Eisenhower say that even during the war it was the best policy to spread the truth. I was dumfounded when he replied in the negative to my inquiry if it was not necessary to use a lot of falsehoods during the actual critical phases of the battles. Although stating that falsehoods were sometimes used at critical periods, he insisted that the truth generally paid even during war. He gave as an illustration when we took the island of Pantelleria. That was his first hop from North Africa. He said substantially: "I would not agree that broadcasts should go to that island to the effect that we were going to bomb it, that we were going to attack it and destroy those there if they did not surrender until we were actually ready to do it, because I was afraid if I did that and did not follow through we would not get the results which you will recall we did get when the attack actually occurred."

I need not call your attention to the fact that Pantelleria was one of our easiest operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, America not only financed but won two wars for the world. America fed the world after both of these wars. America has given and is still giving as well as lending untold millions to help feed and rehabilitate the rest of the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the rest of the world is so stupid as not to know the ideals and objectives of America, then it is just too stupid to ever understand our ideals regardless of any type of program which the State Department may institute.

Mr. Chairman, I have a constituent in Ross County, Ohio, who not only founded but who was the director of the American Library in Paris in 1918, where he served in that capacity for 7 years. He tells me that any attempt to change the ideas of Europeans about the United States is worse than futile. He also tells me that his experience convinces and proves to him that it is not only stupid but absolutely wrong to attempt to tell Europeans what to think. Mr. Speaker, this constituent, speaking with authority, implores me to use my best efforts to prevent any more American dollars being wasted on such stupidity.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this body I have felt for some time that one of the greatest dilemmas with which we have been faced has been our desire to legislate so as to eliminate administrative weaknesses. It is a very difficult thing to do. The executive department has grown tremendously during the past few years, and in this time has developed certain tendencies which fill many of us with trepidation. I believe that the great majority of the Members of this House are for some type of program, and I believe that their worry comes chiefly from the question which has arisen concerning the quality of the personnel. I believe also that a great part of that worry has been justified.

I think one thing should be made very clear, and that is that this is not the OWI. The OIC has inherited certain people from the OWI, but upwards of 11,000 people were employed at home and overseas at the peak of the Government's international information and cultural activities in wartime. In November 1946 the OIC total had been reduced to 3,140 and the present total is about 2,800. I am informed that new people from outside sources were aggressively sought and placed in key positions, and that only the best of those in the transferred agencies were retained.

The merger in the State Department, the drastic reduction in personnel and the adaptation of these activities to peacetime rather than wartime requirements was a gigantic job. It was accomplished in a few months and without any break in the continuity of the Government's overseas information program.

The OIC has come under criticism for the alleged inefficiency of some of its operations and, as I say, there has been criticism of its personnel. With respect to the first point, almost all OIC operations have recently evidenced improvement in terms of the response of foreign audiences, due, in the main, to improvements in operations growing out of experience. As an illustration may be cited the fact that the number of letters received by the Voice of America has increased steadily from an average of about 5,000 to an average of 25,000 a month. The number of people seeing OIC motion pictures abroad has increased until the total is now approximately 10,000,000 a month. Last year, 3,000,000 people used OIC libraries abroad. The number of foreign students assisted has increased sharply, and the placement of articles in the foreign press has also increased.

The interest manifested indicates the growing effectiveness of the OIC measured by the yardstick of the response of foreign peoples.

I might say here that the reports from Italy, from members of the United States press over there, are that the Italian people are very much disturbed at the

prospect that there may be a discontinuance of these broadcasts and other services. They have come to rely on these programs in many ways; and particularly from the point of view of the exchange of technical information with respect to hygiene and other matters, they have come to regard these programs as very valuable. It seems to me that just now, with the Italian treaty ratified, with Yugoslav troops poised on the Italian border, with the threat of riots, with De Gasperi trying to form a cabinet which will exclude the Communists, this is a poor time indeed for us to say, "We will be silent. We will continue to do good by providing you with relief but we will be silent. We will, in the words of Mr. Churchill, do good by stealth."

Since assuming responsibility for OIC nearly 2 years ago, Mr. Benton has been keenly aware of the importance of personnel and he has been constantly seeking to improve the standards of personnel and to bring new and competent people into the organization. I heard the other day, for instance, that an old friend of mine, Stewart Brown, who used to be with the U. P. in Rome, is now the deputy director. Another good man is my old friend John Begg, who is assistant director for media. And there are others. Notwithstanding the uncertainties as to the OIC budget and the problems of integrating the personnel into the Department of Foreign Service, 124 new professional people have been brought into the OIC from the outside since July 1, 1946. Thirty-five of these have been placed in top supervisory positions.

As a further illustration of the policy of strengthening top-level personnel, it is interesting to note that 9 out of the 10 division chiefs of OIC have been changed since January 1, 1946. The total overseas personnel numbers approximately 1,800, of whom about 325 are Americans. Each information staff abroad functions as an integral part of the foreign mission. The reason there are so many aliens is for the same reason that you have them in the Foreign Service, where I believe about 60 percent of the overseas personnel are aliens. Aliens are cheaper and in certain jobs more useful. As far as the domestic personnel is concerned, I would call your attention to the fact that a year ago the OIC employed approximately 290 alien employees, and that within the past year the number has been reduced to 14, a reduction of some 95 percent.

I think those figures are convincing and encouraging and I could go on and tell you something about the individuals, mentioning names and citing records. But there is no time. It is more vital that I point out to you that there is intellectual starvation in Europe today, particularly in central and eastern Europe. When the war was over there was an almost Messianic hope that America was going to come in with the implements of peace as she came along with the implements of war. When I say "implements of peace" I do not just mean relief; I mean intellectual stimulation and comfort. Do not forget that particularly in central and eastern Europe for years before the war all that these people were fed in the way of intellectual nourishment was what the Nazi propagandists

fed them. There is an intellectual aridity in that part of Europe which is the result of this historic fact. There is a moral crisis in Europe and there is an intellectual crisis, too. This crisis is underlined and accentuated by an ethical nihilism which is creeping in all over Europe and which threatens to become more widespread and more barbaric even than nazism. If we do not do something about it nobody will. If we do not assume intellectual leadership, how can we assume political leadership? This is a war for men's minds. We shall be silent at our peril. During the war there was a poem which was revived from time to time as Americans went off to battle:

Though reason chafe and love repine,
There came a voice without reply,
It's man's perdition to be safe
When for the truth he ought to die.

It is important that we in America live according to these truths, but it is also vital that we should declare these truths and identify them and explain them to those who for all these years have been fed predigested pabulum by the totalitarian states. If we do not, we can have no hope of winning them over to our system of government. Democracy must be an article of export if we are to make it survive and spread and serve as a sword and a shield in defense of our system. We 140,000,000 Americans are the happy few who now have the salvation of western civilization in our hands.

If we do not pass this legislation it will be one more indication that we are fundamentally and intellectually isolationists. The people of the world will not believe what we tell them after that. They will not understand all the minor domestic implications of this thing. They will observe that here in America we have decided that we have nothing to say to them. In a world of rapid communications and vehement proclamations we prefer to remain silent. I believe that it is vital that we approve this measure. I have been assured that the personnel will be further improved as it has been improved in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we must urgently shed light where now there is darkness. I believe that we in America, with our idea of liberty which is still the great revolutionary concept of the day, must be articulate in our attempts to throw back the reactionary forces of darkness and despair and despotism which in spite of the war's end still are very much on the march.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are two fundamental problems before us. The first is: Do we want an informational program at all? If that is answered in the negative, then nothing else matters. The second problem is: What kind of program do we want?

With respect to the first problem as to whether or not we want an informational program, my answer would be "Yes."

It was only a few days ago that we observed Memorial Day, and I expect from 10,000 rostrums we spoke of freedom and of a new birth of freedom. That is why hundreds of thousands of young Americans died. And the question is: Do we stop there or do we go on with the crusade? Now, the great obstacle to meeting the yearning of freedom everywhere in the world is falsehood. That is the thing we are contending with in an informational program.

For quite some time now I have been noting some of the falsehoods that go out over the radio, which have appeared in Pravda and which have appeared in Izvestia and some of the other organs of communication. I want to read to you a few of them because they are authentic. They said or wrote in some of these media: "It was the Russians who crushed the Nazis."

You see, we had nothing to do with it. They make it appear that we were not a part of World War II, made no contribution to victory, lost no young men on the field of battle. Millions will believe it if that goes uncontroverted.

There was a motion picture in Prague called Victory Over Asia. A colonel of the United States Army tried to gain access. He had great difficulty. They showed that the victory over the Japanese was won by Soviet troops and there was not an American soldier in evidence anywhere. In that motion picture, which was made by the Soviet Union, they showed the surrender in Tokyo Bay, and there was not an American officer or admiral present. That is the thing that goes on today. Shall it go uncontroverted?

In Pravda they said, "Only Soviet Union has modern equipment." They said nothing about the \$11,000,000,000 of equipment that we lavished upon them. They never mentioned the casualties of the American Army and Navy in the Russian journals. They only had the casualties of Russia.

They stated in Pravda that in the United States there are one and one-half million jobless veterans.

You see, the purpose is to break down confidence on the part of the people, in the integrity and in the greatness of the American system.

In Pravda they said, "Veterans are faced with poverty and hunger, and receive no care from the United States."

In Pravda they said, "There are 350,000 United States soldiers who cannot read and write their own name." They seek to convey the impression that this is an illiterate country.

In Russian journals they said, "Nothing can stop inflation in the United States."

In these same journals they said, "A fierce struggle is going on in the United States."

In those same journals and over radio Moscow they have said, "Only the Soviet delegation at United Nations fights for peace."

You see, we are the enemies of mankind. They seek to establish that we are

imperialists. This is going out over the radio. I heard Moscow radio when I was in Turkey and Greece, and I had the transcriptions translated so that I could understand what was being said.

They have said in *Izvestia*, "World Bank was designed to ensnare small countries."

They said in these Russian journals, "American imperialism has come to kindle civil war in Iran."

They said, "Americans are trying to transform China into a military base."

They said, "The United States interferes in democratic regimes in Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia."

A few months ago they said, "We are interested in the bases in Greenland, because they are intended to bomb vital centers of Europe."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two other items that you should hear. Here is what they said over the radio in Korea: "American soldiers are murdering workers in south Korea."

That is below the thirty-eighth parallel. That is what we occupy. Then they said, "United States troops blowing cholera germs across the border to kill people in north Korea."

What chance has freedom in the world unless the one great exemplar and exponent of freedom in the world can roll back that whole wave of falsehood, can roll back that slow stain that is designed for miserable, impoverished, and hungry people who, like entombed miners, hear the tap-tap of a rescue party, believing there is still a chance? But when this kind of falsehood goes out to 150,000,000 people outside of Russia and persuades them finally that we are the enemies of mankind, then what happens to every effort that we make, consonant with and pursuant to the sacrifices that were made in World War II, to meet and to still the yearning for freedom that is so strong in human hearts in every part of the earth?

I do not know how much it will cost. Maybe ten million will be enough, maybe fifteen million; but in any event we cannot let this kind of falsehood go on without challenge, because it simply undermines the efficacy of everything that the United States seeks to contrive in this world. I saw an example of visual propaganda in Guatemala when I was there. I was talking with our Minister in 1940. I saw how clever these propagandists were. They took the story of the Battle of the Little Big Horn, in which the braves of Sitting Bull had annihilated the forces of Custer, and simply perverted American history and made it appear that Custer's forces had annihilated Sitting Bull and all his braves. Show that to mestizos with some Indian blood and they get the wrong impression about the United States unless it is undone.

In an integrated world where the burden of peace is upon our shoulders, is it not important that we present our message to the world and enhance the hope of a peace that has a chance to endure?

It was not until World War II that we became fully aware of the importance of psychology as an aid to victory. The very fact that we established an Office of War Information to advise people in foreign countries of our objectives and purposes and the added fact that within the Military Establishment itself there was created a Psychological Warfare Branch is the best evidence of the importance of information in the pursuit of victory.

The victory has been won and the problem now is to win the real victory of peace. Who will deny as he appraises the feverish condition of the world today and who knows the difficulties and obstacles to peace and the purposes of victory that it becomes necessary to carry that purpose to every corner of the earth. Other nations are spending untold sums to popularize their viewpoint and their ideology and it is difficult to appreciate the viewpoint of those who would at this stage of the peace negotiations revert to a kind of psychological isolation. If that should be the policy of the Congress and the country then we should recognize at once that in the days ahead it will be America against the world because their efforts in the field of propaganda, information, and publicity will not cease.

The case seems all too clear for a continuation of an informational program and that brings us to the second problem, namely, what type of a program.

At the very outset of my remarks I stated that the proposition before us embraces two problems. The first is whether or not we shall continue an informational program, and the second what kind of a program shall it be.

With respect to this second problem, I share the dissatisfaction of many Members of the Congress with regard to the type and efficacy of the programs that have heretofore been carried on.

Like you, I want to be certain that it will present America in a proper light. I want to be certain that it will represent the spirit, the achievements, and the greatness of this country.

The ministries of propaganda in totalitarian countries are only too glad to obtain, if possible, that kind of literature and that type of motion pictures which presents certain seamy aspects of American life in order to persuade their own people that this country is filled with dissension, racial antipathies, a faltering faith in our own system, and other sentiments which are designed to put us in a bad light.

If such countries could contrive it, they would not care to present to their people historical films which show the growth and evolution of America but instead present such bawdy presentations as Tobacco Road and the Grapes of Wrath, which overemphasize and magnify a facet of American life which is the exception rather than the rule. These ministries of propaganda would be interested in such books and publications as are captious and critical of our own form of government. They would be inter-

ested in radio programs which reflect upon the purposes and objectives of the United States.

All this bears out the importance of placing this program in competent hands who will make certain that the real story of America and the American tradition will be told.

To that end I propose at the appropriate time to offer an amendment which would create an Advisory Commission with power to formulate the policy that would be expressed under the authority in this measure. I am setting out here the full text of the amendment:

Amendment to H. R. 3342: Page 18, after line 5, insert the following title, and change the title numbers, section numbers, and cross references in other titles of the bill accordingly:

"TITLE IX—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES"

"FORMULATION OF POLICIES"

"Sec. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION; GENERAL PROVISIONS"

"Sec. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 10 members, not more than six of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

"(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

"(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

"(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as

such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residences.

"(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

"(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS"

"Sec. 603. The Commission shall from time to time prepare and transmit to the Secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations."

Mr. Chairman, you will observe that an advisory committee of 10 with established reputations is provided for and that the members of such a commission would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Under such a provision if a person with oblique views should find a place on this commission, the responsibility would then be chargeable to the legislative branch. The amendment specifies the background of the members of the commission so that they will bring to their responsibilities experience in every field of communications. They would not be compensated and the amendment requires that from time to time they must transmit to the Congress their recommendations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

I am confident that with this type of a commission there will be a clear and distinct check upon the types of programs to be carried out, and there is complete reason to believe that the real America would be represented to the people abroad as an answer to the untruths and falsehoods which are constantly being disseminated to millions of people concerning conditions at home and the objectives we have in mind in bringing peace and freedom to the hundreds of millions who live in misery today and still nurture a slender hope for liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who only a few days ago made such a wonderful appeal for the continuation of the Voice of America program. Mr. Short's speech was sufficient in itself to have assured the necessary appropriations to continue this vital service to the nations of the world. I commend the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House for bringing this legislation to the floor, authorizing these broadcasts through the legislative processes.

America has assumed a most prominent place among the nations of the world. With such a distinction there goes with it responsibilities which we

should not look lightly upon. For more than 150 years America has gone forward under the principles enunciated by our founding fathers, "rule of the people." It is all the more appropriate that this bill emanated from the House of Representatives. A man cannot sit here as a Member of this body without being elected by the people of the district he serves. Each of us in this body has the distinction which no other public official in the United States could boast. It is the only job to which a person could never take office by appointment.

Now, this program is designed to convey to the radio audiences of the world, among other things, information about our representative form of government, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion. If the trend toward communism is halted, a large measure of credit would rightfully go to these informational American broadcasts.

I believe in economy in the operation of the Government. I do not, however, favor eliminating necessary and needed functions in order to get it. The Voice of America was established on January 6, 1946, by the State Department for the purpose of letting the world know what America is thinking and doing.

These broadcasts are on a 24-hour schedule, beaming programs in 24 different languages to all corners of the world. We do not know what the exact figures are on the listening audience, but they are far greater than most people think. More than 50,000 letters were received by this organization in 1946 relative to this program. Sixty-five percent of these letters were received from Europe, 25 percent from Latin-America, and the remaining 10 percent came from the Far East. Statistics reveal that a conservative estimate of listeners runs more than 100,000,000. This is very indicative of a large world audience.

On this daily schedule of broadcasting, the world hears quite a variety of programs. Thirty-six transmitters are kept in constant operation sending out over 5,000 programs a month. The breakdown of programs shows that of all programs included, 17 percent is devoted to news, 34 percent on developments in all fields of American life, 3 percent on drama, 28 percent to music, and 18 percent in variety, such as radio shows which are familiar to us.

It is very evident that these peoples want and need these programs. They hear them, that we are certain. In a recent letter to the Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, the Honorable Hans Olav, who is the counselor to the Norwegian Embassy, had this to say, and I quote:

I have just returned from a 3 months' visit to Norway during which I talked with and met many people. In literally every place I visited, I found that those who had short-wave sets were keenly interested in the American programs and told me rather proudly that they were able to pick up the United States. They were grateful not only that good music was heard, but also for the occasional educational and other talks carried on the short-wave programs. It seems to me that this living link of the spoken word and musical note between the United States and Norway is of inestimable value to the betterment of understanding between our two peoples.

We know that there are relatively few radio sets abroad in comparison with the number in America. Nearly all foreign sets are equipped with short-wave receivers and the Department's personnel in these countries inform us that people will come from miles to hear the programs of the Voice of America.

It is entirely above all barriers of language, literacy, national boundaries, and censorship. When the former Secretary of State, James Byrnes, made his famous speech at Stuttgart, Germany, last year, the Polish censors refused to tell the people about it. They allowed nothing to be printed and kept everything contained in this speech secret from the Polish people. It was rebroadcast by the Voice of America and soon the Polish censors released all the details because the people had heard it anyway over their short-wave sets.

Letters and reports from the four corners of the earth clearly demonstrate to the State Department that the people are very much interested in what goes on here in America. The British Broadcasting Corp. is spending \$20,000,000 annually in putting 98 program-hours a day in short wave to foreign nations. The 1947 appropriation to carry on these broadcasts amounted to the sum of \$7,804,321, which is not excessive for the great benefits derived.

The State Department has as its target, broadcasts beamed to every country of the world in which there is a radio set. Requests are coming from everywhere to increase the period of time allotted each country. The Balkans want more. Southeast Asia wants more. The whole world wants more.

Let us keep on telling the world about our progress. The nations of the world should be privileged to continue to hear this program. The Voice of America should be expanded, not hamstrung.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

THE PIECES OF THE TRUMAN PROGRAM

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have no word of criticism of Mr. Benton. I am sure he is a very estimable gentleman, and, of course, I yield to no one in my respect for the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and its very able chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Any realistic appraisal of the world situation today makes it obvious that spending money to propagandize our way of life through such devices as the Voice of America is a flagrant waste of taxpayers' funds. The picture of tons of potatoes being deliberately destroyed by our Department of Agriculture did more damage to American prestige abroad than a hundred radio broadcasts can ever repair. Within the past 2 weeks it has been revealed that we have 1,031 employees in the State Department Office of Information and Cultural Affairs in the domestic branch alone. There are hundreds more overseas. We know that their objectives are praiseworthy. They are out to win friends for the American way of life as opposed to socialism and communism. But we shall not win converts to our economic system unless we demonstrate at home that we can solve

our problems more effectively under liberty than they are solved overseas under totalitarian regimentation—on the British Socialist model or the Russian Communist pattern. I urge Congress to use the money we should be wasting in this way to give American taxpayers some indication that we have not forgotten them. Just as Americans would deeply resent any widespread effort by British Socialists or Russian Communists to propagandize us, so do Europeans resent this propaganda technique on our part.

The Voice of America broadcasts are just one piece of the Truman program.

The pieces are beginning to fall into place, and the pattern is becoming clear. It is not a pretty pattern; it is not a pattern which the people of the United States can look on with confidence or with a sense of hope for the future.

Taken alone, something could be said for the avowed purposes of the program embodied in H. R. 3342—the promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies. That sounds like a laudable purpose, and, in fact, such interchange has been going on for generations.

But we have learned to look behind the titles and the labels of measures proposed by the Truman administration.

The Greek-Turkey-aid bill was presented to this Congress as a humanitarian measure, designed to relieve hunger and suffering. The Truman administration attempted to conceal and disguise its true character, which was admitted only after the measure was subjected to searching examination on the floor of the House. Then it was admitted that all of the so-called aid to Turkey was to be military aid, and most of the aid to Greece was to be military aid. The humanitarian purpose turned out to be hypocrisy.

No, Mr. Chairman, we must look behind the high-sounding title in the present bill about the interchange of knowledge and seek out the true character of this measure. Its true character is not difficult to discover. The Voice of America program is nothing more or less than the propaganda arm of the Truman doctrine. It is just one more piece in the pattern of the Truman adventure in international relations.

What are some of the other pieces in the Truman program which have become apparent in the past few days?

On May 26, Mr. Truman urged the Congress to authorize a program of military collaboration with all the petty and not so petty dictators of South America. Mr. Truman submitted a draft of a bill which would authorize the United States to take over the arming of South America on a scale far beyond that involved in the \$400,000,000 hand-out to Greece and Turkey.

Under the Truman proposal the United States would train the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. We would maintain, repair, and replace the military equipment of those nations. We would transfer American arms, planes, ships, and other military items and munitions, together with technical information, and

we would accept in payment for such activity anything which would be satisfactory to the President. This is the most far-reaching proposal for the militarization of this hemisphere at American expense of which it is possible to conceive. It means the pouring out of the resources of the United States in support of the Fascist gang around dictator Perón in Argentina. It means the pouring out of the resources of the United States behind every ambitious dictator-on-the-make in South America. It means turning South America into an armed camp. But this is only one piece of the emerging Truman pattern.

On June 2, Mr. Truman continued his campaign for universal peacetime military training in the United States by releasing the Truman commission's recommendations. Even Mr. Truman's commission did not attempt to estimate the staggering cost of this adventure into militarism at home, but it estimated that the outlay of \$1,750,000,000 a year was only a part of the total.

Let me repeat, this Truman commission itself admits that an annual cost of \$1,750,000,000—more than four and one-half million a day from now on—would be only a part of the cost in dollars of this proposal to fasten a permanent military system upon the United States. But even the cost in dollars is not as important as the cost in American liberty. Every instinct of the American people rebels at the proposal that the military should take over in America. They know that where military control begins, there the basic American liberties end.

But military control at home is a part of the emerging Truman program. The Truman administration is using all its propaganda resources in an attempt to soften up the American people to accept this idea. On Wednesday of this week the New York Times carried the headline "Patterson backs 'military mind'." Mr. Truman's Secretary of War was at Columbia University outlining the charms of the military mind, and according to the New York Times news story, and I quote:

Mr. Patterson was joined in his defense of the "military mind" by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal who cited wartime incidents to give point to his argument.

Yes; the Truman administration is busy in its attempt to sell the idea of military control to the people of America. And hand in hand with this propaganda campaign go secret meetings for industrial mobilization.

On June 4, a widely read Washington columnist reported, and I quote:

One of the most secret meetings since war days was held behind tightly barred doors in Washington's vast Pentagon building last week.

The writer is Mr. Pearson, and no one has attempted to refute his report. He went on, and I quote:

Plans were laid in detail for the establishment of an industry reserve corps of American workers and employers in major American industries.

Purpose of the reserve corps would be to prepare industry for rapid conversion to wartime production in an emergency. Special training courses for employers and employees

will be worked out if the plan finally is approved. The industrial corps would have units in every major manufacturing plant in the Nation.

This is the kind of thing which is taking place behind barred doors in the Pentagon Building, about which the people of the United States learn only by accident. This is a part of the emerging Truman program.

It is against this background that the Voice of America program must be considered. This vast foreign propaganda machine proposed by the administration is a part of this program. It is a part just as Mr. Truman's friendship with the dictator Perón in South America is a part. It is a part just as Mr. Truman's eagerness for universal military training in the United States is a part. It is a part just as Mr. Truman's proposal for arming every South American country to the teeth is a part. It is a part of the whole Truman doctrine of draining off the resources of the United States to support every reactionary government in the world.

I am opposed to the Voice of America just as I am opposed to every part of the dangerous and irresponsible Truman doctrine.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, finally we know just where our colleague stands on this legislation. I suppose we may even assume that he is against all foreign missions.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to this debate and have tried to summarize the objections to the pending bill, I have concluded that the greatest objection is that the program may not be properly administered in the interest of America. This is tantamount to saying that America does not have enough patriotic men and women to whom this program might be entrusted. It seems to me that this is a rather fatal admission for a gentleman to make and, in fact, an absurd position for gentlemen to take.

While listening to the debate I asked myself the question "Is democracy on retreat in the world?" We have just witnessed within the last few hours the trojan horse technique of Russian aggression, and we know that from VE-day on the world has witnessed a bloodless conquest of communism. Communism has been spreading like a prairie fire. All of us know that false Russian propaganda has played an important part in the spread of communism.

I visited Europe immediately following VE-day, and I had an opportunity somewhat similar to that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to hear some of the Russian broadcasts, the only answer to which we can make is to give even more strength to the Voice of America, to the end that we might be able to penetrate the iron curtain of Soviet influence. Immediately after victory in Europe and as soon as the Russians reached Berlin, they started to spread false propaganda. Ten days or 2 weeks after VE-day I was at Magdeburg, Germany, on the banks of the Elbe River. I stood at one end of Friendship

Bridge, which was built by American men and with American money, and guarded at the other end by Russian soldiers. This was the bridge which was used to transfer the displaced persons from one zone to another. Immediately after VE-day—Russia did not wait 24 days or 24 months, but perhaps within 24 hours—a picture of Joe Stalin was placed on a large road sign at the Russian end of Friendship Bridge welcoming the displaced persons back into the Russian occupied part of Germany. The minds of these displaced persons were being poisoned by false propaganda which came from the Russian-controlled radio in Berlin.

Since VJ-day I have traveled in the islands of the Pacific. I was recently in Greece and Turkey. All over the world Russian propaganda is vilifying American democracy and defaming our institutions in the eyes of the people of the world. We cannot say that this propaganda is not having influence. We know that it is having influence. We see definite evidence daily of the spread of communism as it sweeps across the earth.

To abandon this program now would mean that all that has been spent on it in the past and all the good that has been accomplished so far would be a total and complete loss. It would be even worse than a total and complete loss, because the Russians would say to the rest of the world that the great truths which have been heard over American radio were nothing more than false propaganda and that even the American people realized the falsity of the statements which had been made by the Voice of America over the airways of the world and had repudiated the program.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Is it not true that when some 5,000 tons of wheat was given out by the Russians in the French zone here a few months ago there was great fanfare but no mention made whatever when some 2,000,000 tons were given to those same unfortunate people in France by the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. The objections offered to the passage of this bill should not appeal to the intelligence of the Members of this House.

Someone, a moment ago, referred to some statement which was attributed to the Saviour. We all know that the Saviour once said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." We must free the minds of the people of the world by letting them know the truth about the institutions of America. We have liberated the bodies of the oppressed people of the universe. We must not now permit their minds to be enslaved.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think the question before us can be summed up in this fashion. We fought the war not with money alone, we fought it with

money, with men, and with ideas. We are now asked by the opponents of this bill to win the peace with money alone. This we cannot do unless we want to tie one hand behind our backs. We can win the peace only with men and with ideas as well as money.

Let us see what arguments the gentlemen who oppose this bill have to muster against it and how they square those arguments with the arguments they themselves have made in the past.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield as soon as I have finished my statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman referred to those who made arguments against it. We have not had any opportunity to make any argument.

Mr. JAVITS. It has been argued before on many occasions by those who now oppose this bill, and at great length, that appropriations which were made for relief and other purposes to aid in the reconstruction of Europe that they did the United States no good, because nobody knew that they came from the United States, and that such assistance represented the humanitarian and statesmanlike act of the United States. Here is a bill which proposes to make us to make clear to the world just what we are doing and why we are doing it. Nevertheless it is opposed. May I point out that the cost involved in this whole program is at most three-tenths of 1 percent of our program of reconstruction since VJ-day and probably as little as two-tenths of 1 percent.

The second argument which has been made is that our friends tell us that if we just stick to the United States and use all our money here to make this the best system on earth, everybody will want to imitate it. But if we do not tell them what it is, and do not tell them how it works, then they will not be able to imitate it because they will not know what it is, and they will not know just what it is we want them to imitate.

Last, the gentlemen who oppose this bill have told us before that they want to save money, they want to make the program for the world's reconstruction as inexpensive as possible. Is there any better way to save money than to convey information on the policies, the motives, and the ideas of the United States by every media of radio, movies, and press, thereby encouraging efforts at reconstruction within these countries and shortening the time within which we must assist them with the goods which these very same gentlemen have constantly opposed our appropriating money for?

Obviously, what is happening is very simple. The gentlemen who always oppose every measure which would enable the United States to strike a blow for world peace by assisting with postwar reconstruction are opposing this bill.

This bill has one other very important point. It tries to inject into our foreign policy the necessary human quotient. For what is foreign policy? It is nothing but men's aspirations, their hopes, their fears, their prejudices. If we do not transmit ideas abroad we can never hope in an effective way to deal

with the hopes, the fears, the prejudices, and the aspirations of the world.

Finally, this is not a program in the main for broadcasting the Voice of America. The bill has been very wisely drawn and very necessarily drawn to be a program for the exchange of men, too. That to my mind is one of its important and principal points. It proposes the exchange of technicians, of students, and of professors. It proposes to help to acquaint the people of the world personally and physically with each other. Every traveler, every soldier who has been abroad and who has seen the conditions abroad and talked with foreign peoples, will tell you that the most effective way to convince the world that America's purposes are peaceful and constructive, that we want nothing and want to exploit no one, is by having people see us in action on our home grounds. I think this bill, considering its benefits is the cheapest expenditure the Congress has been called upon to make for a very long time.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me ask the gentleman a question in all sincerity. We assume, naturally, that our students going to other nations of the world will try to teach the other nations of the world our form of living, what we are doing in our country, and tell them of our democracy, and so forth. Naturally we come to the conclusions that the people of the other states in the world will do the same when they come here. Suppose Russian students come over here and try to teach us a little more about communism. In this bill there is a provision to prohibit these students from staying here any longer, that we can deport them if their mannerisms or their characteristics are not what they should be. So what do we do? We say, "All right, we are going to deport you." I remember distinctly that only a few years ago the Congress passed a resolution to deport Harry Bridges, but it never happened. I am wondering what might happen in this instance.

Mr. JAVITS. The answer to both of the gentleman's questions is as follows:

The bill prohibits any political activity by any student, professor, or other person who comes over under its terms under penalty of prompt and summary deportation. The case is quite different from the Bridges case where he was admitted as a resident alien; these students and professors are admitted only under the specific limitations of this bill, and these provisions were drawn by the legislative counsel at the committee's request with just such a situation in mind. It is not telling us but boring from within that any American fears, and the bill fully protects us against political activities or activities not consistent with our security by those coming here under the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the headlines in the afternoon papers proclaim

the fact that the Reds have taken over Bulgaria, too. Today it is Bulgaria; yesterday it was Hungary. Who tomorrow? Who is going to be next? The pattern is always the same—infiltration, boring from within, and then a coup d'état. How far will communistic totalitarianism dare to go? What is the end going to be? How will we fare if its objectives are fulfilled?

The bill now before us is going to help to determine how far communistic pressures can go, what the end will be, and what its effect on us will be.

We have decided on the foreign policy of this Nation. We are committed to a policy of aggressive world leadership. We are trying to lead the world away from war, trying to induce men to sit down together around council tables and talk out their differences; to settle them peaceably instead of resorting to war. So we are not concerned with a matter of policy today. The only question before us today is how vigorously we are prepared to back up the policy on which we have embarked. If we are going to provide the leadership which the world needs so desperately, and wants so desperately, we shall have to acquaint the world with the things that America stands for. We know how vigorously Russia pursues her propaganda activities. Concrete evidence of this has been presented to us time and again during this debate. Some of us have seen how effectively this propaganda is carried on in other countries. We know that in all such activities which are intended to foster world revolution and world communism, Russia uses her best minds. There is no limit to the number of persons used or to the amount of money expended. And they are making progress. We see evidences of that every day. There is plenty of fertile ground in the world in which to spread communistic propaganda. Where human misery abounds, and it does in so much of the world, communistic doctrine and hate propaganda find their most effective medium for growth.

By contrast, we are sending out a few outstanding men like Byrnes and Marshall, but we provide them with limited funds and inadequate personnel, often poorly paid and poorly prepared personnel. Yes, in many cases we are sending out file clerks for diplomats, and then sitting back and expecting diplomatic wonders. It cannot be done. Starvation policies will not produce results, either in the State Department or in foreign lands. We must keep abreast of the times and fight fire with fire. We must tell the world what is going on in this country and what this country stands for.

We need not concern ourselves about the threat of war—not now. But 5 years from now or 15 years from now, I do not know. Then it may be too late to concern ourselves. We must keep abreast of what is going on and match propaganda with information so that the world will know what this Nation stands for and what it is trying to do. Then our leadership will count in the world.

We have more to sell in this country than any other nation on the face of the

globe. We have Americanism. There is nothing else like it. We must let the world know about it. Communism is being sold to the world today. It is time we learned to sell Americanism. We can do it if we will. This is one means of doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, and particularly its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], for bringing it before the House. They have performed a real service to their country and to the world.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I recently made.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDE. Mr. Chairman, before we close this debate, I want to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle on the splendid spirit of nonpartisanship shown here today. I am glad that there is a general understanding of the great problems now confronting our country in the foreign field and that it is generally realized that we must make the voice of America heard and understood throughout the world.

I wish to pay tribute to the great chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who has worked so long and hard for world understanding and cooperation. May I pay tribute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], chairman of the subcommittee and author of this bill, who has so effectively led the forces in favor of this program?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his kind expressions, and I reciprocate them.

I now yield the remainder of the time, 5 minutes, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to pay tribute to our brilliant and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. He, with his subcommittee, has worked very hard and very wisely in the preparation of this bill. He has had the unanimous support of the membership of the whole committee on both sides. He has brought a good bill here, although we admit that no single piece of legislation will meet all the requirements of this vast and complex problem.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for his kind words. I have a very profound affection and regard for him, as I have for his colleagues. It is encouraging once in a while in the political rough and tumble to get something besides a brickbat.

I want to stress the necessity for this legislation. I join with everyone in disgust and disappointment over the absurd failure and unnecessary mistakes and of this program in days recently gone by. When, for example, I saw that

unspeakable picture of a fat prostitute designed to be sent out over the world as a picture of American womanhood, I almost gave up in despair. But that has gone over the dam, with a great many damns along with it, well deserved, and we now confront a situation from which there is absolutely no escape.

This world is shaken to its foundation. Every race everywhere is disturbed, spiritually as well as economically and politically—shaken from all their old foundations. God only knows what the future will mean for our children and for future generations in all the world; but one thing is certain, we are going to go up or down together, and this Nation of ours stands today as the one great leader, I believe ordained of God, to call the rest of the world into a time of hope and progress, after the chaos resulting from war. This is why I want to see America interpreted to mankind so that our leadership will receive full understanding and response.

What is America? It is not boots and shoes and gadgets to be sold, as one gentleman here seemed to think today. It is not a certain way of acquiring automobiles or bank buildings or bank accounts. Somebody asked me the other day, "What is America?" I answered, and you must forgive a poor ex-preacher for this point of view: "America is a beautiful soul." That is what has made America a spiritual and material power: A passion to be free, a consciousness of the dignity of the individual made in the image of God, a great passion that men should have full opportunity to realize themselves. That is the spiritual reality that we mean when we say "America."

What is an American? An American is a man whose soul loves the soul of America. No matter what color he is, what his politics may be, what part of the world he may be born in, if his spirit responds to the spirit of freedom that created this country and made it the hope of the world, he is an American.

Our problem now, Mr. Chairman, is to make Americanism dominant in every portion of the world. The only way to do that is to drive out bad ideas by putting good ones in their place and keeping them there.

I hope this legislation will go through, and I hope the Government will summon men of vision, men of spiritual passion and understanding, to organize and develop this program and make it a success.

The first step, as I see it, is for the Members of this House to overcome their fears and anxieties and prejudices and vote for this legislation. Let us do a good job—while we are at it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS
SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

ARE WE AS DUMB AS WE SEEM?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, leaving out all reference to purposes and motives, let us take a look at what we are doing.

Not long ago the Congress voted \$350,000,000 to be used to aid the unfortunate people of Europe. That appropriation was made not only because we are kind-hearted, solicitous for the welfare of others, but for the added reason that we desire to stop the spread of communism.

The argument was that hungry, suffering people were more apt to listen to and adopt false teachings than were those more comfortably situated.

Then we came out in the open, and, yielding to the President's plea, the Congress voted \$400,000,000 military aid and access to billions of dollars of war-surplus supplies to aid the Governments of Greece and Turkey. Again the effort to frighten our people in order to get them to support this measure. The argument was made that Russia, with its communistic hordes, was marching south and east.

Assume for the moment and for the sake of the argument that our fears were justified and that to protect ourselves from Russian aggression, from the march of communism, it was necessary to use our dollars, our materials, and our men to stop communism at the Turkish frontier, a doctrine to which I do not subscribe, let us examine our subsequent action.

Having embarked on a policy which will cost billions of dollars, mountains of materials, and perhaps the lives of a million or more Americans if war comes as a result of that, the other day, day before yesterday, ratified a treaty with Italy. Under that treaty, and a policy which we have adopted, billions of our dollars will go into Italy and of those dollars, Russia, under the present treaty will get from Italy one hundred million.

Will someone please tell us why we should give our dollars, our materials, and the services of our men to stop the Russians and Communists from moving south and east, and at the same time make it possible for Russia to obtain money from Italy which can supply it only because of our money and material; from Italy which contributes only because of our insistence, thus using the aid which Russia receives from us through Italy to strengthen the movement of the Communists south and east?

But, Mr. Chairman, the height of absurdity is reached here today in this proposed legislation. Under this bill we are asked to authorize the expenditure of additional billions which when expended will tend to defeat the objectives which we are told we are seeking to obtain when we appropriate the seven-hundred-odd-million dollars for foreign aid and for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Millions of the taxpayers' money are to be spent to stop communism in Greece and Italy, and now today, by this bill, we are asked to authorize the expenditure of other millions to bring teachers of communism here where in American schools, colleges, and universities and in public forums they can, and they will, advocate the acceptance of communism.

Apparently what we need is some sort of institution to examine and determine whether we are sane, dumb, foolish, or just emotionally overwhelmed with theories handed to us from abroad, or by those the Republicans in days gone by, characterized as wide-eyed, long-haired fuzzy-wuzzies.

Into my office within the last few days have come hundreds of cards from farmers protesting the cuts in the appropriation bill for the Agriculture Department. Those cuts were made because it was necessary to cut down on our expenditures. We have taken the money away from our own farmers and now are told we must give it to the State Department to spend to bring guest speakers of communism to teach our children what they should do.

When will the Republicans who are hanging onto the tail of the "international kite," let go, get back to earth and common sense?

I have voted to cut domestic appropriations time and again because I thought this Government of ours needed a little economy. Now, you turn around here, denying to the farmers of the country the money they asked to enable them to improve their production in order to feed the hungry people across the seas, and you appropriate those same dollars you asked me to take from the home folks to bring Communists over here to undermine our Government. Does that make sense? To me it does not. I am telling you, I am getting pretty tired of voting against the interests of my farmers or what they think is their interest, voting against my own interest from a political standpoint, and having some Members of this House, some of them Republicans, dish out millions upon millions of dollars to these foreign governments and to the New Dealers and left-wingers on one pretext after the other. Why does the Congress do it? I would like someone to tell me.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman does not sincerely believe that Russia is going to let anybody come over here and teach us anything, does he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the idea then of appropriating the money? Why waste the money?

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman does not believe that Russia is going to let teachers come over here and teach us anything, does he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, certainly, if we are fools enough to accept their teaching. Does not the gentleman know that Russia has been doing that very thing for the last 10 or 15 years. Does not the gentleman know that some of

them have already been convicted? What does the gentleman think Browder and Foster have been doing for the last 20 years?

Mr. CHELF. I am talking about under this bill. They do not want their stooges enlightened by us capitalists.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the object of this—have us pay for their propaganda. This bill will let them come over here and teach our young folks, not the old folks—we are too hard-headed—but take the youth of the land and teach them communism, and we, under subsection 3, pay them \$10 a day to do it. I say it is all nonsense.

Mr. CHELF. Do not undersell the youth of America.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that Russia has her instructors in almost every college in America teaching communism and undermining America.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And under this bill we are going to pay them for coming over here, feed and house them, and probably clothe them, and wine and dine them while they are here. See section 4, page 13 of the bill for the authorization for entertainment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan in asking unanimous consent to withdraw his motion because along with the rest of us he would like to expedite the public business and get along with a consideration of the merits of the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why did not the gentleman give us some time then so we could discuss the merits long ago?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry, we only had 60 minutes. I did not have the time. I would have been glad to have given some of it to the gentleman if I would have had more time.

I do not now want to take much time discussing the particular motion to recommit to the committee because the gentleman himself has offered to withdraw the motion and wants to continue discussion of the bill. I want to correct one misunderstanding, however, which has arisen about this bill. It does not provide any place, anywhere, for paying the expenses of foreigners who want to come to this country. He said we would be paying Communists to come to this country. Such is not the case. This

legislation simply corrects a situation which now exists rather than creating the conditions which he said might exist if this bill becomes law.

As I said in the debate earlier, there are now 3,696 Russians in this country today who came here quite apart from any relationship whatsoever to this bill. If you read the language on page 3, you cannot miss it. When this bill becomes law it will no longer be possible for the Russians to have 3,696 people in this country while denying Americans the right to visit their country. We are correcting in this bill that which the gentleman complains is taking place, but we are not creating the problem; we are, in fact, correcting it. As to the second aspect, about somebody coming over to our schools and teaching our children communism, I call your attention to the language, mostly in monosyllabic words, on line 21, page 3:

If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General.

That is a safeguard not now existing. We write that into law when we pass this legislation. It does not become operative unless we pass the bill, but if we pass the bill, then it becomes an effective safeguard.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman just what article 4 on page 15 means, if it does not mean expenses of travel throughout the United States for foreign-born itinerants.

Mr. MUNDT. That is something entirely different. Of course, we provide for information tours. We have been doing that with the Belgian editors. We have been doing that with the Argentine journalists, and we have been doing that for many years with people that we officially entertain in this country. It does not provide for payment of tuition in colleges and educating other people unless we deliberately bring to America designated groups or individuals that we ourselves are eager to have educated in and about America.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What does section 3 mean then?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. In order that the Record may be quite clear, I think the gentleman has stated it, but I would like to have him state it even more clearly, is it the intent of the committee that drafted and sponsored this bill that the provision on page 3, section 201, to the effect that the Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges, and so forth, does not in any way mean that there is any obligation to pay the expenses of such interchanges?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. There is no obligation. If at some time the United States finds, as it may

well find, that it is desirable to bring additional students from a country like China, we could, if there were an authorized expenditure for such a purpose, make payments, but there is no obligation at all in the language of the bill requiring the United States to do so. It is not at all contemplated as a general policy.

Mr. COUDERT. The reason I asked the question is because, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to be sure just exactly what the intent of this bill is so that when the Department comes to us and says we want "x" million dollars to transport students from abroad and keep them here we know just what was intended by the Congress in enacting this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There may be many countries from which it is important that students come to this country, and which cannot get American exchange to support them here. In those cases it would be possible under this language—and it is intended—that the United States should assist in the transportation and maintenance of those students. Almost invariably arrangements can be made with the university or college where they study in America for them to have free tuition or scholarships, but their transportation and maintenance might be provided by us in certain cases where it is in our national interest to do so.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, with that explanation before us, I ask that the motion to recommit be defeated.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the purpose of this bill is to sell America to the rest of the world. There is an old saying that if a man is honest he need not go around telling people about it, his actions will speak louder than his words. If America has not been sold to the world in the last 160 years, I doubt very much if \$31,000,000 is going to sell it to the world now. For 100 years or more the people of the Old World have been coming to this land in such large numbers that 25 years ago it was necessary to put the bars up to pass a law known as the quota law. They had heard about America. I suppose there are many Members on the floor of this House like myself whose parents both came from the Old World, long before the days of the War Between the States. They had heard about America and its government of freedoms. Since that time they have come in such increasing numbers that as I say, we put the bars up. In that period of time the people who came to America have been in constant communication with their relatives, their friends, and their neighbors across the

sea. They were told of the blessings of liberty and life here. You have never heard of any exodus of these people from our shores. A recent poll taken in England of people between the ages of 18 and 30 on whether they desired to emigrate to America showed 80 percent in favor of doing so. In Italy over 90 percent were in favor.

You say that America has not been sold to the world? Let me say as a member of a committee who left the shores of the United States less than 2 years ago and journeyed in some 15 countries of Europe with one exception people came to us and asked if there was not something we could do to help them come to the great United States. If America, this land of opportunity, has not been sold to the people of Europe would they be so eager to come to the United States?

Not long ago I was talking with Mr. Constantine Brown, foreign news analyst for the Washington Star, a very distinguished journalist and columnist at the very top of his profession and nationally known. He spent the first 4 months of this year in various countries of the old world, Europe particularly. His statement to me was: "All of Europe would like to come to the United States if they were permitted to do so." Do you think it is necessary to sell the United States to the rest of the world, when you go to foreign countries and stand in the presence of long rows of white crosses of the men who wore the uniform of our country and died in the cause of liberty and freedom? Do you think it is necessary to sell the United States to the rest of the world after we have spent some three hundred billion dollars and sacrificed the lives of 300,000 of our precious American boys? Europe knows that hardly a nation or a people across the ocean but has received aid from us. One of the problems of our army of occupation in Germany while I was there—the summer of 1945—was to keep the Germans who were in the Russian zone of occupation from coming into the American zone of occupation. They know us well and knew they would be better treated under our flag? Of course they know.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There is no man in this House for whom I have greater respect than I have for the gentleman from Michigan, and I am sure his people in Detroit, Mich., have that same feeling, based on his integrity, ability, and devotion to duty. But does not the gentleman find it necessary and advisable periodically to go back to Detroit to tell his people what he has done here and why he did it? Is his good work here enough, unless he describes it to them, and explains the reasons for his actions? Does not the gentleman find that of value to him?

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps it is what I stand for and what I do and the way I vote in this Chamber rather than what I say back home.

Mr. JUDD. Do not you have to have both—the deed plus the word?

Mr. DONDERO. May I suggest that this \$31,000,000 might be better spent, if it must be spent, in cleaning up some of the problems here at home rather than to try and tell the rest of the world what it already knows. This bill is unnecessary and a waste of public money. I trust this bill will be defeated.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I am under the impression that the gentleman is in error. He is laboring under the impression that this aims to encourage immigration. This bill has nothing to do with immigration nor does it advocate immigration.

Mr. DONDERO. Not at all. I know perfectly well the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I realize the futility of attempting to defeat this bill, but since we may not have a chance to cast a record vote, certainly I do not want the record to be silent as to my position in connection with this matter.

Of course, I do not question the good faith of anyone or the right of anyone to support this sort of legislation. I can well understand how my friends on the other side of the aisle would be all out for a program that may call for \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 or \$50,000,000 or \$100,000,000 to be expended during the campaign year of 1948 by the executive branch of the Government. I do not blame them. This bill has some peculiar things in it. In the first place, there is no limit to the amount that can be appropriated. Section 601 on page 12 says, and I quote, "Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized." How much? There is no limitation. Certainly, under the present leadership, I assume that Mr. TABER would not go hog wild. But there is no limitation whatever upon the amount that may be spent for this sort of a program—no limitation whatever—a blanket authority to the Committee on Appropriations to spend all of America's substance if necessary. This is too much authority to place in the hands of good men. But our friends supporting this bill say it is a program to sell America to the rest of the world.

Sell America? I wonder if the Gold Star Mothers of World War I in this country whose sons are sleeping over there think that it is necessary to sell to Europe and the rest of the world the interest of America in breaking up dictatorships and aggressors. I wonder if the Gold Star Mothers of World War II think that it is necessary to spend a lot of money now to sell the people of Europe and other parts of the world on the greatness of America.

We sent our kids over there in two world wars to fight. Thousands of them are selecting on foreign soil as a sacrifice to American ideals.

Someone said recently that we had spent \$15,000,000,000 since the close of World War II, in aid to the rest of the world. The facts are that a recent survey shows that more than \$20,000,000,000 in technical and economic assistance has gone abroad in the past 2 years. Fifty-nine countries are benefiting today from United States economic and technical assistance extended since the end of fighting in world War II, and then the proponents of this measure say that it is necessary for us to go on an all-out spending spree, in order to convince the rest of the world that America loves them and wants to help them.

The money spent and converted in this tremendous program to help rehabilitate a war-torn world, includes \$12,000,000,000 in loans, direct grants and relief expenditures, lend-lease, and surplus property credits and expenditures on collateral and technical cooperation projects, plus this country's \$2,700,000,000 contribution to UNRRA and \$5,925,000,000 subscriptions to the world bank and monetary fund.

A partial break-down by countries, according to a survey made by Mr. Garnett D. Horner, shows the all-out pouring out of the public purse strings by Uncle Sam, to aid in rehabilitating countries everywhere in the world:

Albania: United States' share of UNRRA supplies from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946, was \$13,052,284. Additional \$27,450,000 allotted by UNRRA in July 1946.

HIGHWAY TO CANADA

Australia: Lend-lease shipments since VJ-day estimated at \$17,500,000. Fixed war installations, costing \$37,394,000, including 30 airports and 11 seaports, transferred through last June 30.

Belgium: Has received \$100,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan. Lend-lease aid from VJ-day through last September 30, aggregated \$68,000,000. Surplus property costing \$380,000,000 transferred for \$54,000,000. Two airports and 39 other fixed war installations transferred.

Canada: Alaska highway, which cost United States \$138,312,166, turned over to Canada April 1, 1946.

Czechoslovakia: Export-Import Bank credits of \$22,000,000 and surplus property credit of \$9,304,694. Also benefited from UNRRA.

Denmark: Export-Import Bank credit of \$20,000,000, plus nearly \$20,000,000 in surplus property credits.

SHIPS FOR FRANCE

Finland: Export-Import Bank credits aggregating \$77,500,000, plus \$15,000,000 credit for purchase of surplus property. Also benefited from UNRRA.

France: Export-Import Bank credits amounting to \$1,200,000,000, plus \$720,000,000 surplus property credit and additional credit for purchase of 75 Liberty ships. Many fixed war installations transferred.

Great Britain: Loan by special act of Congress of \$3,750,000,000, plus \$650,000,000 credit for surplus property and lend-lease settlement. Approximately 800 fixed-war installations transferred.

Greece: To get \$250,000,000 economic and military assistance under special Greek-Turkish aid program, plus share in post-UNRRA \$350,000,000 relief program. Export-Import Bank loan of \$25,000,000, surplus

property credit of \$45,000,000 and another \$45,000,000 credit for purchase of ships have been made available. Lend-lease aid amounted to \$75,000,000 as of last June 30. Also benefited from UNRRA.

DIRECT AID TO ITALY

Iceland: 27 fixed-war installations costing \$65,000,000, including three air fields, transferred as of last June 30.

Italy: Received \$140,000,000 in direct relief administered by Foreign Economic Administration. Export-Import Bank loans and earmarked credits aggregate \$130,000,000. Surplus property credit of \$10,000,000 available. Total of \$258,000,000 credited to Italy for lira used by American troops in Italy under special financial agreement. To share in new \$350,000,000 relief program.

Netherlands: Export-Import Bank credits aggregate \$263,000,000, plus \$20,000,000 surplus property credit. Lend-lease shipments from VJ-day to last June 30 amounted to \$50,000,000. Eighty-four fixed-war installations, valued at \$44,384,624, transferred.

New Zealand: Surplus property credit of \$5,500,000. Twenty-two war installations, costing \$207,069, transferred.

Norway: \$50,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit. More than \$6,500,000 in lend-lease supplies shipped since VJ-day.

Poland: Export-Import Bank credit of \$40,000,000, plus \$50,000,000 surplus property credit. Benefited from UNRRA. May share in \$350,000,000 relief program.

Portugal: War Department and Civil Aeronautics Administration have trained Portuguese personnel in weather-observation techniques, operation of communications equipment and other air navigational aids. Airports in Azores returned to Portuguese control.

LEND-LEASE FOR SOVIET

Spain: Air strips in Spanish West African colony of Rio de Oro, built under 1945 agreement, transferred to Spain at price of \$136,697, which was 56 percent of declared cost.

Soviet Union: Approximately \$250,000,000 in "pipe line" lend-lease supplies, to be paid for in 22 annual installments beginning in 1954. Benefited from UNRRA.

Yugoslavia: Received much help through UNRRA.

Burma: Has received approximately \$11,000,000 worth of lend-lease transportation equipment.

Egypt: Airport built near Cairo during the war transferred to Egypt as part of \$11,800,000 surplus property deal.

Ethiopia: \$3,000,000 Export-Import Bank and \$1,000,000 surplus property credits. Benefited from UNRRA.

India: To retain more than \$50,000,000 of proceeds from sale of surplus war property in India. Many war installations, including 62 airports transferred.

Iran: \$25,000,000 surplus property credit; is negotiating for another \$30,000,000. Lend-lease aid in 1946 fiscal year amounted to nearly \$5,000,000. Many war installations transferred.

THE TURKISH LOAN

Iraq: Approximately \$41,000 in educational aid.

Lebanon: More than \$90,000 in educational aid.

Liberia: United States building \$20,000,000 airport at Monrovia, and operating 5-year sanitation program involving expenditure of \$200,000 a year.

Syria: More than \$10,000 in educational aid.

Saudi Arabia: \$10,000,000 Export-Import Bank loan, plus \$2,000,000 surplus-property credit. Air base at Dhahran transferred.

Turkey: To get \$150,000,000 from \$400,000,000 Greek-Turkish aid program. Has been granted previously \$40,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit, plus \$10,000,000 surplus-property credit and additional \$5,000,000

credit for purchase of ships. Educational aid amounts to \$65,000.

Yemen: \$1,000,000 surplus-property credit.

China: Export-Import Bank credits total \$82,793,750 so far. Lend-lease aid after VJ-day amounted to about \$700,000,000. Surplus property costing originally about \$900,000,000 sold to China for \$210,000,000 under complicated payment formula. Big beneficiary under UNRRA. To share in new \$50,000,000 relief program.

Philippine Republic: Special aid authorized by Congress amounts to \$695,000,000, including \$400,000,000 to pay private war-damage claims.

Austria: War Department has shipped about \$60,000,000 worth of civilian supplies to Austria. Export-Import Bank granted \$1,000,000 loan. Surplus-property credits amount to \$2,000,000. Benefited also from UNRRA.

Germany: War Department has furnished more than \$400,000,000 worth of civilian supplies.

Hungary: Has used half of \$30,000,000 surplus-property credit; remainder suspended last week following pro-Communist government change. Fate of \$7,000,000 Export-Import Bank credit, uncertain. Benefited from UNRRA.

Japan: War Department has provided \$267,000,000 worth of civilian supplies.

Korea: More than \$37,000,000 in civilian supplies shipped by War Department through March. Army is handling \$25,000,000 surplus property credit. Benefited from UNRRA.

Argentina: \$193,000 Export-Import Bank credit extended to Argentine firm for purchase of harbor barges here. United States expenditures on cultural and technical cooperation amount to about \$104,000 for 1946 and 1947 fiscal years.

Bolivia: Cultural and technical projects, \$245,000.

Brazil: Export-Import Bank credits of \$70,000,000. Cultural and technical projects amount to \$680,000. Several air bases transferred to Brazilian control.

Chile: Export-Import Bank credits, \$42,000,000; cultural and technical projects, \$195,000.

Colombia: \$517,800 Export-Import Bank credit. Cultural and technical projects, \$342,000.

Cost Rica: Approximately \$1,300,000 spent for building parts of Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica. Cultural and technical projects, \$240,000.

Cuba: Cultural and technical projects, \$190,000.

Dominican Republic: Cultural and technical projects, \$75,000.

CREDITS FOR MEXICO

Ecuador: Export-Import Bank credit of \$1,000,000. Cultural and technical projects, \$288,000. American-built air base at Salinas and military base in Galapagos turned over to Ecuador.

El Salvador: \$165,500 spent on building parts of Inter-American Highway in El Salvador; \$160,000 on cultural and technical projects.

Guatemala: Inter-American Highway expenditures, \$232,700; cultural and technical projects \$425,000.

Haiti: Cultural and technical projects, \$86,000.

Honduras: Inter-American Highway expenditures, \$354,500; cultural and technical projects, \$63,000. Naval base, Puerto Castilla, turned over with American-built installations.

Mexico: Export-Import Bank credits total \$87,000,000, including \$50,000,000 authorized during recent visit of President Aleman, which also resulted in \$50,000,000 currency stabilization agreement. More than \$574,000 spent on cultural and technical projects.

OTHER OUTLAYS

Nicaragua: Inter-American highway and Rama road expenditures, \$1,250,000; cultural and technical projects, \$180,000.

Panama: Inter-American highway expenditures, \$13,000; cultural and technical projects, \$34,000. Ninety-eight defense sites returned to Panama.

Paraguay: Cultural and technical projects, \$38,000.

Peru: Export-Import Bank loan, \$450,000; cultural and technical projects, \$470,000. Air base at Talara, costing \$2,000,000, turned over to Peru.

Uruguay: Surplus property credit, \$666,666; cultural and technical projects, \$67,000.

Venezuela: Cultural and technical projects, \$144,000.

The United States also is contributing to cooperative health and sanitation projects in many Latin-American countries on a long-term basis, with figures on expenditures not broken down for the 2-year period covered in this survey.

My very able friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a master at this microphone, read a whole list of lies that had been published in Pravda and other places about the United States of America by the Russian press and Russian radio. Does he mean to imply that we should start on a program of lying ourselves to offset the lies that he says Russia is telling about us? Is that the implication to be drawn from his statement?

If the people whom we expect to reach by this broadcast are not "sold" now on the American way of life and the largeness of the American heart, then we had better give them up as a bad job. Certainly if they have not been sold by the practices of America in keeping with the philosophy of the Saviour when he said, "I was hungry and you gave me food; I was thirsty and you gave me drink; I was naked and you clothed me"—they are not going to be sold by a bunch of high-powered radio commentators' slick tongues who are able to put out a multitude of expensive, honeyed words.

If we want to do a better job of selling America, let us spend some more money by increasing our Embassies and our Legations, and sending genuine Americans over to inhabit the Embassies and the Legations—rather than pouring out millions of dollars over short-wave broadcasts which necessarily must be largely lost in the air because of the absence of receiving sets at the other end of the ether waves. Does anyone believe for a moment that Uncle Joe Stalin is going to permit the Communists in Russia to keep short-wave radio sets to listen to American broadcasts?

We better be realistic about this business. We Republicans in the House said we were going to cut the budget \$6,000,000,000—did we mean what we said? Well, we cannot cut the budget if we continue to vote unlimited authority for unlimited appropriations on schemes of this kind.

I make the bold statement that if everyone in the House will read this bill in its present form, without comment from anyone, that there would not be 50 votes in favor of the bill.

This bill should be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps a woman can speak from her heart about the thoughts and feelings of women, wives, and mothers, whether they be gold star or blue star or whatever they may be. We have a gold star mother in the House. I have not talked with her as to her feelings about this bill. I do not know how she feels, but I do know that the women of this country do not want any more wars and that they are willing to expend everything, save only their honor, in whatever seems wise to set up the kind of a climate that peace can live in. That is a climate where there is understanding, and there cannot be understanding unless there is exchange of thought and ideas. The best way to get exchange of thought and ideas is in exchange of personnel. There has been so much said about this radio program. I am all for it. As it happens I know something about international radio. I know it is not easy, if you give up your frequencies to get them back again. There is truth in what has been said on this floor in that regard. I think it would be the height of stupidity for us to lose hold of the air rights that we have. It has not been easy to get them. If you are familiar with the Havana Conference and so forth, where all the radio people met and tried to do each other out of wave bands. To relinquish our bands, would be little less than stupid.

I would like to emphasize the exchange of teachers, of students, of technicians, of specialists of all sorts with all the countries of the world. There are other countries in the world than Russia. Why do we do nothing but talk about Russia, Russia, Russia? Yes; she is the other big titan, that is true. She is a very strong country, we hear, but is she not a very weak country, really, for she does not have even the fundamentals of right living. She does not know what it is to do something for the other fellow. She has not learned that the height of happiness is to do something for somebody else. Without such knowledge no nation has begun to live.

We who are women want every possible thing done that will lead to greater understanding. We want to open the paths to the consciousness of other people. We want them to know what it is we have here, even though it is still imperfect. This bill has been most carefully worked over by our committee and by our subcommittee limiting and protecting where such provisions were necessary. I am certain this House is going to pass this legislation for I have confidence in the sanity and judgment of the Members of this House. Through this program, well used, we shall be setting up two-way roads to understanding. All who want from us will be giving us much in return as the exchange of skills, of ideas, of ever-increasing fellowship slowly bridge the dark river of doubt that must be spanned as we build the great highway to peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as far as the foreign broadcasts are concerned there may be some merit in them when they tell what America thinks; but I was utterly disgusted with the broadcasts that went out from the State Department to Russia while Henry Wallace and Harold Stassen were over there misleading the people of Europe as to what the American people thought. They reminded me of the Irishman who came back from a trip to France and said the French were so dumb that he could hardly make them understand their own language.

If you will provide that a copy of every broadcast be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate for the inspection of the Members after it is sent, in order that we may know what is going on, that program might have some merit; but if you are going to put a bunch of semi-Reds down there to pump a lot of Red propaganda into Europe to mislead them as to what the American people think, you will be doing the American people irreparable harm.

Another thing, you provide in the bill for the exchange of professors. God knows if we could send out of this country a boatload of professors once a month for a while, we might be doing this country a great deal of good.

And talk about deporting anybody. It is all we can do to get Eisler tried, much less deported.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. And we could not even deport Harry Bridges despite a resolution of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. No; and we could not even deport Harry Bridges. The Supreme Court finally made him a citizen.

These Communist professors are in almost every college in America, and they are undermining and destroying confidence in this Government and trying to destroy the American way of life. I am speaking from the cards, because I have heard the testimony, and read the testimony, taken by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we cannot reform the Communists who are here in America, how can we hope to reform the Communists in their own back yard?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly we cannot. Great Britain is not asking to send any teachers over here. These teachers will come from behind the iron curtain. That is where they will come from—Russia.

I would like to vote for a reasonable bill, but there should be some amendments taking out the vicious portion of this measure.

I realize that it is a good thing for the rest of the world to know about America, but do you think they do not already know? Do you think they do not know now that we are going to send propaganda there? Do you think this is going to help if we send propaganda

there to try to make them believe that the United States is on its way to communism? If you let some men broadcast that is the kind of doctrine they will get.

I submit this bill ought to be seriously amended. There ought to be a provision that a copy of every broadcast should be sent to the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate to be inspected by the Members of Congress that we may know what is being told to the people in Europe. Then there are these provisions here for bringing people over to this country from behind the iron curtain. That provision should be eliminated. We have too many of that kind here now.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if the world by this time does not know our ideals and our objectives that they are just too stupid ever to understand them, regardless of any type of program which the State Department may engage in?

Mr. RANKIN. The statesmen of the world know about the American Government. After the last World War almost every government in Europe crashed. They rewrote their constitutions, or reformed their government, but not a single one of them followed the Constitution of the United States. Governments have crashed since this war closed and they have set up other kinds of government, but not a single one of them has followed the pattern of the Government of the United States.

You have a lot of propaganda going out from this country today over the radio, through picture shows and even through the press, that is misleading as to what the American people think. I for one am not willing to continue that kind of policy at Government expense.

This bill should be drastically amended or recommitted to the committee from which it came.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this bill. In my opinion, it is perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation that the House will have an opportunity to consider. Because I am not a member of the committee I have not felt the necessity of speaking for the bill, as there seems to be a great deal of interest in favor of the bill. However, the gentlewoman from Ohio presented a challenge to me I feel I must accept.

I would like for you to know I feel that America has a great deal to be proud of up to this point. Our people have conducted themselves in a way that the country can be proud of and we can stand behind them. But we of the Congress cannot let them down at this point. This great task is far from being finished. Our boys have done their part. The people of this Congress must do their part at this time in helping to make the peace if we are to live up to the ideals that our servicemen established and the things they felt they were fighting for

when they went overseas. I have many letters, and I am sure all of you have, outlining the things they were doing, the reasons why they were on the battlefronts, the things they felt they were doing for the people at home. It is just as important now that we carry that standard and those ideals forward and that we keep our position at the head of all nations and that we fulfill our opportunity for leadership.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the importance of education, that we must educate our children in this Nation if we are to maintain our place as a leader of nations. The world is too small now to think of only one nation when we speak of education. There is no better way for us to carry on a program of world education than through the plan presented by this bill for the Voice of America. It is very important that we help students in other nations, students who live in other lands, to understand our plan of education. We also have an opportunity to learn from them about their way of life.

For quite a long time now in the public-school program we have been exchanging student teachers with colleges of other countries in order that they would know more about our plan of teaching and our method and administration of public-school education and could go home and carry out the things we feel are important. Our student teachers have gained much in understanding of world affairs. The same purpose will be served in teaching people about our country and the things we want them to go home and teach their people. This exchange of students with other lands will have a wide influence toward creating a greater confidence and understanding of our way of life.

The plan for the Voice of America is a fine plan and I urge your support of it.

Mr. BUSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time. This is the first section of the bill. There are many more sections of the bill to be read.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have not made a request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does the gentleman want to cut us off now? At least let us talk about it. If you are going to broadcast to the whole world, let us broadcast to you a little bit.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman wants to speak I will not make the request.

Mr. BUSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because of the necessity of taking a plane in a short while for Chicago, and I may not be here for the final roll-call vote on this bill.

I think everyone in the House knows that I probably have criticized this program of the State Department as much if not more than any other Member. The criticisms I have leveled at the State Department have been justified. I do not hesitate to say that I believe the total

number of hours I have spent right down in the State Department day after day, week after week, month after month, total more than the combined number of hours spent down there by all Members of this body. More than likely I am the only Member who has gone to New York and spent a whole day in the broadcasting station, there to find out exactly what has been going on. I criticized the art project very vigorously on the floor of the House on May 13. I criticized the personnel of this department under Mr. William Benton on May 14. I inserted in the RECORD the names of those to whom I objected and my reasons for doing so. Therefore, I believe I am qualified to speak on this particular bill. If the truth were known, in all probability I am one of the few Members of the House who has taken the time to read every single word of the hearings on this bill. Unfortunately there are some defects in it. I hope you will see fit to adopt the various amendments to remedy them.

I am extremely sorry that the committee during the hearings did not go into the personnel problem in greater detail. One of the best things that could happen to this program would be to let it die on June 30 and start a new one. Why saddle the Secretary of State, General Marshall, with all the personnel that is in the Department at the present time? Let him employ these people temporarily until he selects the ones he desires to maintain permanently on the staff.

In spite of my vigorous opposition to the program under present operation, I am going to vote for this bill, because I believe General Marshall will correct the existing situation. However, he cannot perform miracles, and I assure you that if some of the changes I am requesting are not made, I shall ask permission to bring your attention to exposures of this Department which are shocking. I feel that there is a place in the policy of our Government for a program of this kind if it is conducted properly by the right personnel, becoming and fitting to the standards of the United States of America in the eyes of the world.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to commend the gentleman for his fine work. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that this bill could come to us today with better grace if William Benton would resign?

Mr. BUSBEY. That may be the gentleman's opinion, but I do not think, if he knew William Benton, that he would expect him to resign before this bill is considered by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say, however, to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] that if this bill passes

the Congress and becomes law I, for one, feel that there are many people in this country who can conduct this program much better than Mr. William Benton. I hope Mr. William Benton does resign to make room for a capable administrator, because he has not done everything he should have done to correct his personnel problem in the State Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As a member of the committee who listened to Mr. Benton, I want to go on record as expressing my full confidence in him as the administrator of this program, and express the hope that we will continue to have him if this program is continued in the future. I think he is a good, sound, American.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio said very seriously, "Those who want from us will give to us." I have not seen that in operation yet but I hope to live to see it in operation. When that comes about, we will be all right from then on as far as our budget and one thing and another is concerned.

I am going to vote against this bill. I have weighed it for some time in my mind and come to some conclusions which I am willing to defend.

A businessman in my town who came here from Europe in the twenties and has done well and made money came down here and wanted me to fix him up and get the necessary papers so he could go over to Europe to gather up the remnants of his family and some of his friends if he could find them. He spent nearly 3 months over there. I had quite a conversation with him recently. He carried a considerable sum of money from other people in America for their friends over there, so that he might go through the narrow streets and hunt for these poor people. He said that everywhere he went the people are thankful for what America has done except in England where, he said, you cannot find a man who does not take pride in telling you to your face that the only reason America got in the war was to save our own necks. But as far as Europe was concerned, he said, we should not send any money over there. They will never help themselves as long as we continue to do it.

It does not make any difference how much information you put back of the iron curtain, even if you get it to the people, because they are helpless. It is like selling religion in the world through the centuries; to sell religion to the poor beggar in the street who had no influence or prestige does not get you anywhere. What we have done over there does not help the little people. The politicians are satisfied with the ignorance of the people and their power over them. It keeps them in their positions.

He said that in the five countries he visited he did not come to a place where

he could not buy a steak when he wanted it. He said it was costly, that they charged you for your napkin, they charged you for your knife and fork, and they charged you for your chair to sit on, but you could get it.

He said that he left there in the twenties and they had two classes there then, and they have two classes today. The only badly off people he found were the displaced persons. You will not help them with this information and the expenditure of more money. I am not voting for any more money to go out of this country to Europe.

He said, and I believe him, for he is honest and his friends are over there, that they will never help themselves as long as we continue to dump money in there and make bums out of them.

I said, "How about communism over there?" He said, "You do not see or hear much of it. They do not call it that and do not talk about it. A man who employs less than 30 people is on his own and has hard going, but a man who employs more than 30 people has government aid. He has material that he has to give to the government."

So you can see those governments are doing nothing for their poor people. They never did. They always had two classes and they have two classes now. He said he saw no beggars compared to what he saw in the twenties when he left Europe, because the poor are getting relief, and the others are getting along. I said, "How about merchandising?" He said, "It is as good as it is here, in the five countries where I was." I said, "Where did they get the merchandise?" He said, "They are manufacturing and they are importing. The stores are full of people. There is a lot of money, but the people are doing nothing for themselves."

So I am not going to support this legislation. You can talk all you want about the iron curtain, but the people behind the iron curtain are helpless. The few who are in control dominate. That applies all along over there. Those governments, those political leaders, have never done anything for their poor, and they will not do anything for them now except to continue to feed them.

This information comes from the grass roots, from a man seeking his friends. He said he smuggled several of his friends out of Poland across the border. I said, "How did you do it?" He said, "You can do anything over there with money. It is all black market, double cross, and graft. You stroll down to the border with some money in your pocket and say to the guards, 'You stroll,' and they will stroll." He said, "You can take as many friends across the border as you want to. As long as you are only going over there with money you are only building up graft, double cross, and blackmail."

Now, my friend is a businessman and he has a genuine interest in his friends and relatives and I am taking his advice.

I will not vote for another dollar to go over there when we have so much need over here with an unbalanced budget. You Republicans ought to remember that you promised a balanced budget. You promised to save money. Now, show that you mean what you said.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, like my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSHEY], I, too, supported my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee on the State Department, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, in striking out the appropriation requested for this activity of the State Department.

I have no doubt that on the record before them that subcommittee was fully justified and that the House was fully justified because of the inadequacy and the deficiencies in the execution of the program. For my part, in voting as I did to do that, I was actuated primarily by a desire to call attention to an inadequate and improperly conducted program and clear the underbrush so that we could start afresh with a new operation in a very important field. To my mind, there is one and only one justification for this program, so much of a justification that I can hardly, I am ashamed to say, see the other side.

In effect, if we turn down this bill we are taking from our Government a weapon, a potent weapon, in the great conflict of the times that we are living in; as much so as though we gave up the atomic bomb, although there is, of course, a difference.

This is a weapon. We are confronted today in this troubled and dangerous world with the choice of two alternatives, it seems to me. One: We may succeed, and God help us if we do not, in bringing about some semblance of peace through cooperation and bona fide efforts of the United Nations or a similar organization; and, failing that, we are headed, I fear, into a tragic and inevitable conflict with that other great power that seems determined to achieve peace solely by conquest of the entire civilized world.

In either alternative, the part that is played by the United States is going to be enormous. We are the other great power. I think we are the great power. To say to our Government and to our Department of State that you shall not be permitted to use—that you shall be deprived of one of the greatest of modern weapons, the weapon of ideas, the promulgation of idea—propaganda, if you like—is to say, in effect, that you are deprived of a great and vital weapon. It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I think we should pass this bill because in principle it is sound and in principle it is necessary. I am not so concerned as to its form; it may be that it could be improved by amendments.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Should we still go ahead with compulsory military training if these beautiful ideals are going to work? Do we need them both?

Mr. COUDERT. I am very much afraid that we may need them all, because if we fail to achieve peace through cooperation we will be faced with the greatest danger since this Republic was born, and there is no weapon that we can afford to give up and there is no potential friend or ally from one end of the

world to the other whom we can afford to neglect or surrender.

I hope the bill passes.

Mr. BREHM. Talk softly and carry a big stick; is that right? An olive branch in this hand and a sword in the other hand? It does not make sense.

Mr. COUDERT. I am afraid so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to some of the provisions of this bill that have not been discussed during the entire 2 hours of debate, and only briefly touched upon.

The distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said there was no provision for paying the expenses of citizens or subjects of other countries or for paying their traveling expenses included in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Not at present. I read from section 702, line 20, page 14, of the bill:

In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department, and the other Government agencies are authorized—

And now I read from page 15, line 8, item No. 3—

under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I still refuse to yield because I want to complete the reading of these provisions in the bill.

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study—

All that I have read applies to citizens and subjects of other countries.

Mr. Chairman, the section I shall now read, in my opinion, does not even rise to the dignity of respectable nonsense. Listen to this:

to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I refuse to yield. Now, does that limit the societies whose expenses are to be paid to con-

ventions? All that is required is that they be concerned with furthering the purposes of this act. Any communistic society or other society known to be subversive could avail itself of this provision if it was concerned with furthering the purposes of this act.

There are no safeguards. Furthermore, who ever heard of paying the expenses of members of private societies with taxpayers' money. I repeat, this proposition does not even rise to the dignity of respectable nonsense.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that on the floor of the House \$5,000 was appropriated for the WCTU convention in Atlantic City here recently.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I do not remember anything about that. I most certainly did not vote for it.

I am opposed to this entire proposition and hope that this bill will be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently throughout this session supported President Truman and General Marshall in what I thought to be their foreign policy. When it came to the Greek-Turkish loan I did not hesitate but voted for it because I believed that it would accomplish its announced purpose, which was to stop the rising tide of communism in Europe.

Then when this bill came up today, as far as the title is concerned "The Voice of America," I am for that at least as far as radio broadcasting is concerned. It will not help much but it will not hurt anything. But I do think there is one provision in here that is dangerous, and it is this section here providing for the exchange of students, professors, and technicians.

I am a little surprised that the author of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, a man who ought to know the way the Communists work by infiltration in educational institutions, surprised that he would bring this thing in here at this time. Now, 3, 4, or 5 years from now when we get a little more settled condition in the world it may be all right to let them send their teachers here. You know what they will be, they will be teachers of economics, they will be teachers of history and government, they will be teachers of politics. Those are the fields in which they will work their subversive influence.

Now, you talk about good will. You do not have to talk about the boys who lie dead over on Normandy and Omaha beaches, you do not have to talk about the boys who did not come back from Europe, but for 2 years we had two or three million of the best ambassadors of good will scattered over the face of Europe that could possibly be found. They performed many acts of kindness. They were kind to the children of France, Belgium, Luxemburg. They shared

their rations with them and gave them their candy bars. They made love to the girls in those countries, they broke their windows, they had their little differences, but they gave their chocolates to the children and cigarettes to the adults. These more than offset the little irritations.

To say that this program can take the place of the three or four million ambassadors of good will we had over there is just asinine, it is ridiculous, it is nonsense.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I wonder if the gentleman knows, touching the matter of subversive activities, that this bill has the unqualified support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and that practically every Member who fought in the last war is for this resolution today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know anything about the Veterans of Foreign Wars; I do not know anything about the American Legion, or anyone else being for it; but I do know that in the light of our past experience, certain provisions of this bill are utterly inadequate.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think it a pretty good idea to listen to what the Members of Congress have to say who came back from over there?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think the returned veteran is the one to speak, the ones who bears the scars of battle upon them. They are not opposing this bill in Congress today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say this. I spent 2 years in Europe, and I am against this exchange of workers and students provision. The gentleman made a great deal of this little magazine *Amerika*, of which the State Department distributed 50,000 copies and told us about its being so dog-eared after the Russians got through reading it. I just wonder how long since Joe Stalin has been anxious for us to send over that booklet telling about Abraham Lincoln and the capitalist system? That is what is told in that booklet. If Joe Stalin wants that kind of stuff sent into Russia, why are we spending \$400,000,000 to stop Russia in Turkey? If Joe Stalin is getting down to this "old buddy" kind of stuff, then the hundreds of millions we are spending are going to waste.

Talk about exchanging teachers, professors, and technicians. I well remember the experiences we had in 1938 when we had an exchange with German professors in some of our universities. They would get hold of graduates from West Point or Annapolis, pump them dry, and then 2 years later sink them in the North Atlantic. That is what we are going to get now. Why do we want Russian professors over here teaching economics and government? Why do we want a Russian professor over here talking to his roommate and preaching communism to him? Oh, you say he can be deported. Well, some of the gentlemen will tell you how hard it is to get the Attorney General to deport Mr. Gerhart Eisler. Here you are giving them the cloak of legality

to come in and preach communism. They will not be Eislers. They will be here under the sanctity of the law. It is just ridiculous and that portion of it should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I call the gentleman's attention to page 5, section 301. It appears that anyone can be brought into this country on the approval of the Secretary of State. In other words, just get on the boat and come over here. But if it is proven that he is undesirable he has to be returned under the immigration laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. Who is going to check on them?

Mr. ELLIS. It seems like they can come in on invitation by the Secretary of State, but if they are found to be undesirable they have to go back under the immigration law of 1917. If anybody knows of anyone who has been sent back or disturbed under that law I would like for that gentleman to tell us this afternoon. That man will be here just as safe as you are as long as he wants to stay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure of that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman knows all the students and professors he has talked about have not come here under this program. They came in under the laws that existed long before this bill, and still exist. Does not the gentleman realize that we are making an effort here to correct, not aggravate the situation? We are trying to do two things: To put on a reciprocal basis those countries which have been sending students and professors to us but who have been unwilling to let ours go to them, and to assist in interchange of students and professors between the United States and dozens of countries besides Russia, countries that we are not afraid of and that are not sending over political agents, and whose good will and understanding we desire and need.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that we should get further than the first section of this bill before we start giving additional time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, we have not had much opportunity. Give us a chance to air our views.

Mr. MUNDT. I have no desire to cut the gentleman off but I do not want to give an extension of time to everyone.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman has not had an opportunity to speak. He has

been questioned here. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma indicates he does not want the time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, on November 5 of last year there was a change in the political complexion of this House on the promise of those who ran on the Republican ticket that they would quit the doctrine or idea of saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung hole. Do not think for 1 minute that the people of this country do not know that we have been making these vast appropriations for foreign relief. I voted for the \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. They know that since this war closed, when we were saddled with a debt of \$300,000,000,000, that we have spent an additional \$15,000,000,000 in Europe and in Asia.

I want to just talk to you for a few minutes about the provisions of the bill and what it really means. There has not been much said about it. This bill is the largest, most far-reaching blank check for power and money, provided they can get it, that has ever been before this House. Now listen to the provisions:

SEC. 701. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) * * * to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries.

There is an unlimited power of attorney that you give to the Secretary of State to give money, materials, and anything he sees fit to any nation and anybody in the world, at any time, in any amount.

2. To furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries.

Now, if you want to vote for that and then face the angry members of the parent-teacher associations of this country who are showering this House with protests against cutting the school-lunch program to the extent of \$30,000,000, why, go to it. If you want to get on a wagon like that and ride and be in the attitude of a drunken man taking a joy ride in the dark, who knows he is on the wagon but does not know where in the hell he is going, why, go to it.

To go on:

3. Whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property, both within and without the continental limits of the United States, for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act.

Did you know that was in there? That is worth knowing when you vote on this thing.

4. To furnish official entertainment necessary for the purposes of this act.

I have heard that word "entertainment" in acts before. I always tremble when a representative of this country goes abroad to negotiate with representatives of foreign countries, because I remember that we never lost a war but never won a conference. I remember that when our representatives started out for Yalta we took with us bourbon and scotch, and Stalin took vodka and champagne, and from what happened there his vodka and his champagne were more potent and more bewildering than our bourbon and our scotch.

Now, the President took his son Elliott along as an official witness, and Elliott wrote a book. He said that on one occasion, when he quaffed drinks through the bubbles of the champagne, and when everybody was high, that Joe Stalin proposed a toast to the 50,000 Germans they proposed to shoot without a trial, and Elliott said—I do not doubt his veracity; the people who interviewed him cannot deny that he is entitled to some credit, because they put him on the witness stand. He claimed that Churchill was full; I doubt that. He may have been feeling good, but he seemed to have sense—he protested that toast of Stalin's and said that it was contrary to Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and his conception of justice, and thereupon our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, suggested a compromise, that they only shoot 49,500 without a trial.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Then, Elliott said, he staggered to his feet and they all joined in the toast.

When you go to explain to your constituents back home about the money you are authorizing to be appropriated for entertainment, there is just one way to entertain an international meeting, and that is with alcohol. I am not making a prohibition speech but I will make this observation: I have read history and I have observed mankind for a number of years. I never yet have heard of a drunk hero or of any man who found wisdom in the bottom of a bottle.

That is not all. Here is some more of this blank check you are asked to sign and turn somebody loose with, God only knows who:

To establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors representative of the fields listed in section 201 above.

To provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States.

To employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, persons on a temporary basis, and aliens within the United States.

That is what you are asked to do. Do you want to do it?

The truth of it is, my friends, let us just wait a little bit. Why this hot haste? Why this hurry? You are fixing to do

something that commits this Congress to the appropriation of uncounted millions of dollars. Why not recommit this measure and bring in a measure here that will protect the people of the United States?

Here are these bawdy pictures that they hold up as representative of the men and women and the boys and girls of the United States of America. How many million dollars did that cost the American people? Do not think for 1 minute that we got that folderol for nothing. We paid for it up into the thousands of dollars, and we caught them with the goods, caught them breaking up the hatch although they had taken time to hide the shells; we caught them with wool in their teeth, caught them in the very act. Now they come back and want more money. One of my friends over here said Mr. Benton is sponsoring this thing. He is the fellow who is responsible for it.

Let us take our time, now. Do not worry. We are spending money over there now by the millions every day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They might have wool in their teeth, but the lady does not have any clothes on.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is the reason they painted her picture.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 5 words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not too enthusiastic for this bill. I have some apprehension as to whether or not it will be administered as it should be. If it is, then it will be conducive towards peace, and that is why it has an appeal to me. I think this bill is 10 times, yea, a hundred times better than the Greece-Turkey matter that I opposed with all the vigor of my soul, which was not too much, I grant you; at least, it had very little effect. But I think this bill, if it becomes a law and is properly administered, will help to bring about peace.

I have not heard a word from anybody yet about what the other countries in the world might give to us. We are, in my judgment, becoming too big-headed in this country. It is liable to lead us to war and has helped to lead us to war in the past. We do not have enough of the spirit of the Master about us, I am sorry to say.

I love this country with a fervor. I would be willing to give my life, now, any time, for the old red, white, and blue. I offered it once and came near giving it on half a dozen battlefields in the First World War. I like you folk on both sides of the aisle. I have learned to think a lot of you, and I am going to like you whether you like me or not; but I am saying to you that with all the admiration I have for you and the consideration I have for you, there is too much hate in your hearts.

There is not enough real Christianity in my heart or the heart of any one of us.

Let us look at the record. Right before the last war, according to information I have gleaned from the Encyclopedia Britannica, the World Book, and other authentic publications, documents, records, and so forth, the people in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden had practically eliminated tuberculosis among their

cattle; and the cheese and butter and milk from those countries brought premiums on the world markets because of their purity.

A number of other diseases which plagued us were, so I understand, eliminated by those people. So, you see, we can learn a great deal from them by exchanging students and scientific knowledge.

Why, you ask most any school child in America where the largest trees are and he will say, as I heard it alleged on the floor of the House, that they are out in California. I have a high regard for the great State of California although I was born in Texas and raised in Oklahoma, but the biggest trees in the world are not in California. We think so. Why? Because it is so easy for us all to become bigheaded, to think that everything we have is the biggest and best in the world. I can see, my friends, that this great beloved country of ours for which I am willing to give my life is about to be catapulted into an empire to try to run this world, and I am against it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this measure will help to bring us back to common sense. Some great man made this statement. He said, "I never met anybody in all my life who did not know more about some things than I know."

How true that is, my friends. I have never met anyone, however ignorant he might have been, whether he knew his A B C's or not—no I never met anyone who could not tell me a lot of things. I have been somewhat of a student all my life. I was admitted to the bar to practice law when I was 21 years of age. I am a former county attorney. I practiced law privately for 8½ years. I was a district judge for 9½ years. But there is a lot of law that I do not know and millions of other things I do not know.

I say to you that I believe these people coming from foreign countries can bring us some good ideas. I am not scared to death just because some might come from Russia, or some other country, and just because a few of them might get in a position where they might brag about their country, that they are going to turn us communistic. I say, in my judgment, there is too much hysteria and people are unreasonably scared to death. We over on this side of the aisle have not convinced you on the other side of anything, and you on your side have not convinced us of anything different from our original political philosophies and yet we have been doing a lot of talking, each trying to convince the other for a long time, and both meeting with failure in that effort.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I came here today pretty well prepared to be in opposition to this bill. It does not have everything in it I think it should have, but I do think there is one very important safeguard. That, I believe, you will find on page 21, section 908, line 6. It says:

The authority granted under this act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It has never been done, and that is the answer to that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman for that information, but this is my first term. I have a lot to learn.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that although I do not think this bill has everything that I would like to see in it, that it is worth a trial. I certainly hope that this will be the antidote for the insidious diseases and poisons spreading throughout the world. I hope we can sell the peoples of war-torn Europe and of the Far East on the idea that Americans are people who love peace and want peace and want to be friendly.

I just came out of a rough war. I do not like being shot at. I hope I do not have to be shot at again. I hope this bill will be a means of convincing the people of the other countries that we do not want to be shot at and that we do not want to shoot at them. We want to be friendly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is what I was trying to get at. That is what we had in 1938 and 1939. We did not want to shoot. We wanted to be friendly. We knew it but Germany did not know it. That is the whole thing. I think you are going to build up under this exchange of students. We are going to sell the idea that we are peaceful, and everybody will find it out except Russia. We do not need to tell the people in America about it. We had better start talking about preparedness and not get into what we did in 1938 and 1939.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me. The gentleman said that Germany did not know how we felt about it in 1938 and 1939. I, too, believe we should have a strong national defense. I hope we do not have to use it. I hope this bill will provide ways and means of preventing us from using it—I am economy-minded. I have voted for economy ever since I have been here, but I am not going to be for economy if I have to be shot at again and if my buddies have to be shot at.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I wish to say that I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. I came here convinced that I would not support this bill, but after hearing the information given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I think I shall support it. There is one correction of a remark that I would like to have explained by the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, although he does not seem to be here right now. That is about the \$5,000 appropriation for the WCTU. That was by unanimous consent, and it was an educational matter, dealing with opium and such as that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to know that. I was concerned about that.

To continue, I hope this bill is passed. I intend to vote for it and I hope that

my vote will be received all over the country in the spirit in which it is given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the required number of words and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said concerning the personnel in the offices that are disseminating information from the Voice of America. It so happens that I attended college with some of the top men in that organization. I have before me a letter from the wife of one of the top men in Voice of America, who also attended college with me. I know the writer of this letter and her husband well, because they were personal friends of mine. I want to read some excerpts from this letter. I am particularly interested in the fact that our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has changed his ideas since meeting in New York with the top men of the Voice of America. Mr. Delgado, the husband of the party who wrote this letter, was one of the men he visited. These excerpts from this letter from Catherine Morgan Delgado are very interesting. She is the daughter of a former Supreme Court Justice of my State. Mr. Delgado, in my estimation, is one of the most intelligent young men I have ever had the privilege of meeting.

This letter says:

Several weeks ago Congressman BUSBEY visited the New York office of the State Department's radio branch, met three men who are largely responsible for what goes on the air from the United States. One was my husband, Mucio Delgado, still a constituent of yours (and still a Knight of Columbus from Arizona)—

I may say parenthetically he is a very ardent Catholic—

who is chief of the Broadcast Division; a second was John Sheehan, head of the New York office, a very devout Irish Catholic who has been known to frown at anyone reading a copy of PM; the third was Mr. Thayer of the Russian desk, a relative of the Cabots and Lodges of Massachusetts, long a United States Foreign Service officer, who during the war served with the Army's OSS.

Those who cry for sifting out Communists and other subversives seem to forget that the FBI has been screening these Civil Service people for years. In an operation conducted in 26 languages to reach 67 countries it is naturally impossible to fill out a staff completely with citizen personnel sufficiently familiar with local dialects and backgrounds to be effective. Even so, of the 522 radio staff members here more than 200 are World War II veterans and a large proportion of the rest are United States citizens whose loyalties cannot be questioned.

I want you to listen to this particular part because I think it is very important. The writer says:

Incidentally, when you hear bluster about inefficiency and waste, remember that 522 people are putting out in 26 languages at least three times as many broadcast-hours as any domestic commercial network. This

compares to NBC's roster of 10,000 employees in New York.

As a radio widow who knows only too well that long hours often make up for what some informed believers have termed a ridiculously inadequate set-up, I resent that sort of unfair Americanism and criticism.

I happen to know these people. When we come here and bluster and bandy words about without knowing what we are saying I think is most unfair. We have heard a great deal of talk here today and we have had crepe draped around some of the war heroes and the Gold Star mothers, but if any of you are willing to carry the responsibility for a third world war and the death of your sons and grandsons you just vote against this program today. You must not do it for the simple reason that we cannot afford to fight a war and have our sons die on foreign soil, spend our money to win a war and then go silently home and let the rest of the world tell of their activities while we die at the roots.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting in the rear row just a few minutes ago with four chairmen of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. I heard these gentlemen remarking about the difficult time they were having in reducing expenses, cutting costs. I can readily appreciate their dilemma because I too am a Republican and I promised along with other Republicans that we would cut the cost of government to the bone.

I recall as a member of the Committee on Public Works that we had a meeting early in the session and we had a sort of gentleman's agreement that we would not submit any new projects, that we would not approve any new projects during this session of Congress. In my own county of Cuyahoga in which the city of Cleveland is situated, there is a river, the Cuyahoga River.

In 1946 the War Department recommended certain improvements at the port of Cleveland. These are shown in House Document No. 629, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. Among the recommendations made by the Government was that six railroad bridges that are a menace or hindrance to navigation be replaced with new bridges and that one bridge be rebuilt.

The total cost of these improvements is estimated by the Army engineers at \$13,236,800, of which the Federal Government would spend \$10,927,400 and the railroads \$2,309,400.

Until such time as these bridges are replaced, plant owners along the Cuyahoga River are unwilling to set aside money for plant improvements because they are unable to move the larger type of Lakes boats along the river because of the narrowness of the bridge openings.

It is especially important at this time that funds be provided to replace bridges Nos. 25, 8, 9, and 1. These four bridges would cost \$8,800,000, of which the Federal Government's share would be \$6,975,500 and the railroad's \$1,824,500.

First on the above list is bridge No. 25, owned by the Wheeling and Lake Erie Railroad. This is one of the oldest bridges in the inner harbor and the opening is very narrow with the result that boats move through the draw with great caution and this bridge is an extreme hazard to navigation.

Two large steel plants are located above this bridge on the deep-water channel, one of which is the property of the Defense Plant Corporation, and is leased to the Republic Steel Corp., and the other is owned and operated by the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

If the Government makes an appropriation for the above bridges, construction will start almost immediately as the railroads are advancing funds for the preparation of plans and are ready to pay their share of the cost of the bridges.

In the rebuilding program for America and the world, steel and steel products in unlimited supply are necessary, and when these old railroad bridges are replaced the steel companies located in the Cuyahoga Valley will be able to increase their production.

This and many other worthy projects are being sidetracked in the name of economy.

We voted in this Chamber to reduce President Truman's budget by \$6,000,000,000. Now I am informed that we will be lucky if we reduce it by \$4,000,000,000, or possibly \$3,000,000,000. For the life of me I cannot understand my Republican friends when they are willing to spend \$31,000,000—this item has been upped from nineteen to thirty-one million dollars—to tell the people of the world how wonderful we are. We appropriate money to continue governments that the common people of those countries do not want. Do you think the people of Greece want the present Greek Government? Do you think if the people of Russia had a chance to get rid of some of their leaders they would not jump at the chance? Do you think in Czechoslovakia and in Poland they like the kind of government we helped to put over on them? Do you think those people love us in America for permitting a Soviet regime to rule in many of these countries? Now we anoint their heads with oil, we supply them with money, and we are going to spend \$31,000,000 to tell the people how wonderful we are. The natives do not think their governments are wonderful. If they had anything to do with it they would come over here. They would get out of those places. They do not need to be educated about the United States of America. They love our country. They would like to come over here, and you know it. But they do not appreciate our keeping corrupt rulers in power with our money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there not a bill in the Judiciary Committee by which 400,000 of them are trying to get over here?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. There are many who have come in here illegally now trying to stay here. How in the world are we going to be consistent Republicans

and reduce expenses if we vote for all these boondoggling projects?

You do not need \$31,000,000 to tell the people of the world about the United States. If they have not learned up to this time, with an expenditure of \$300,000,000,000 in the last war, they never will learn. The United States of America is not asking the world for a thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have we not left a black trail all across Europe, especially in England.

Mr. BENDER. Someone said that England is spending \$50,000,000 for propaganda. Sure. It is our money they are spending in England. Is it not true we provided the money for them? We are perpetuating a Socialist government over there, a government that is far out of line with what we have here in the United States of America.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And they are negotiating a loan with Russia which will certainly come out of the \$3,750,000,000 we loaned Britain.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman never made a truer statement in his life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the Jackson Day dinner was held last night in Los Angeles, Calif., to an enthusiastic crowd of over 1,300 Democratic Party leaders. The scheduled national speakers were John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and Gael Sullivan, acting chairman of the Democratic Party, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

The national committeeman of California, Edwin W. Pauley, used his influence to cancel the appearance of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Sullivan a few hours before the banquet hour. It was therefore too late to secure national speakers to take their place. The excuse given by Mr. Pauley, was that he disapproved of a tentative draft of policy of the State Democratic committee which mildly criticized the Truman doctrine. The draft of policy had no connection with the Jackson Day dinner. The recent speeches of Mr. Henry Wallace in California have given rise to the rumor of a Wallace slate of delegates in 1948. There will undoubtedly be a Pauley slate for Mr. Truman. By the stupid political action of Mr. Pauley, Mr. Snyder and Mr. Sullivan in gratuitously insulting the official State Democratic Party organization, James Roosevelt, the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of California, and the third speaker of the evening, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, there will now undoubtedly be a third slate of delegates headed by a Roosevelt, a name very potent in California.

Such a development would no doubt, put California in the Republican column in the presidential election of 1948. If

it occurs, the Republicans can thank Edwin W. Pauley, the man whose nomination for Under Secretary of the Navy was rejected by the other body of the United States Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thought for a few minutes that the gentleman from California was giving a Voice of America broadcast. It sounded like some of the broadcasts that I heard from the Voice of America in Europe after the war was over. Those broadcasts made me blush with shame. The broadcasts I heard in Europe were not the voice of America but the voice of the radical left-wing New Deal of this country. I am sure the Jeffersonian Democrats in this House would have blushed with shame and denied they represented the true America.

I came over to the House this afternoon expecting to support this bill. I believe in selling America to the world. I have had some bit of experience, as some of you have, in traveling around most countries of the world. I had one experience that I wish to tell you about down to South America. I took a trip on a Norwegian freighter. No one could speak English but the captain. There were only a few of us on the boat. On that Norwegian freighter there was a short-wave radio set. What do you think we got in the way of broadcast? Broadcasts from Italy, Germany, and from those broadcasts they put out a little news about America. I was shocked about the news from the United States, because some of those broadcasts made me feel that the people in Detroit and Chicago were starving to death. The broadcaster mentioned a murder in the United States. Why, you would have thought that half of the town was in a riot. It was such a poor picture of America. And, I felt all along that the Congress, that our State Department, or that someone ought to be selling the true facts of America to the world.

But, in looking at this bill presented by the committee, you find not a bill to beam radio program to other countries, but a bill so wide and open to include bringing an unlimited number of aliens to our already overcrowded schools. This will crowd out many a worthy GI. It is not a Voice of America broadcast bill. It covers the whole field of information, transfer of funds, official entertainment, with our citizens paying the bill.

Let me point out some other features of the bill. The purposes of the bill in the report seem to be all right; I cannot quarrel with them, but let us explore the bill. Here are some of the things it will do.

On page 3, line 9, there is a provision for some foreign guest instructors to help sell America.

I find on page 6, line 4, and again on page 13, lines 16 and 17, some references to official entertainment. Now, is that part of the Voice of America? I think that this representation, as has been pointed out, is liquid refreshments of some kind. I just cannot go along and say to the farmers and the folks in my district that "We are going to tax you to help furnish liquor and drinks and other

forms of entertainment to a lot of foreign guests of this country." I also feel this, that the committee should keep in mind that the universities of this country are lined up and crowded with American GI's that want to go to school, and in this bill we bring in an unlimited number of foreigners to crowd out the veteran. It should be pointed out that we are already bringing in thousands of students and they just do not go back. They come in under the nonquota provision of our immigration laws.

Then I find, on page 15, that they pay for travel, conventions, and social activities, yes, pay \$10 per diem to make them welcome. The bill carries no limit on the amount of money to be so spent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. While you are paying your veterans something like \$200, you are going to pay these folks their travel expenses and \$300 a month.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It just does not make sense to me.

On page 5, lines 1 and 2, it says these aliens are going to help teach English here. Perhaps they will add to the ever-increasing rolls of ism teachers in our schools.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does the gentleman think as a physician that, after we have drenched England, France, Italy, Russia, and all those other countries with our benefactions and our goodness, using a hypodermic needle on them now to the extent of \$31,000,000 will do any good?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This country is not on very good terms with the rest of the world. You cannot buy friendship; my experience in traveling the world over tells me that few countries like us. Bonds from all South American countries were, with one exception, defaulted after World War I.

It appears in this bill that the same old crowd of OWI will run the program. We best let this group go out of existence and start anew. I will support a real radio selling program to the world, but not the voice of radical left-wingers that are now in control. This bill is too broad and not in the interests of America.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman who just preceded me, I came here with the thought of supporting a reasonable bill—something which might involve some moderate expenditure for the Voice of America. I am literally astounded by reading this bill. It seems to me to have no limits outside of heaven for practically anything one wants to do. The provisions of it are broad, and deep, and wide, and they cover practically the entire world.

Let us take a few items very quickly. Take section 201. There is no limit to the number of people who could be taken into the country or sent out of the country under these provisions. Is it 10, or

10,000, or 100,000? I have no idea. Everything is left up to the Committee on Appropriations. Has the Committee on Appropriations become the legislative body of the House of Representatives? According to this bill, I think it would be.

Take section 202, which provides for publications, books, periodicals, and so forth. No limit again. Go the limit. Nobody seems to care.

Take section 203. We go into the question of providing for education and assistance to schools. At the present time we have people in this country begging for assistance in education. The schools of Arkansas, the schools of Texas, and the schools of many States need educational help, and we cannot give them a thin dime, but we can come out here and say, "Spend what you want on education abroad, whatever the Appropriations Committee will give you."

Go over to the next page, section 301. You can assign anybody you want to any purpose, in any number, except you cannot assign the Army and the Navy to help the Army and the Navy of some other country.

Let us go to the next page, section 303. We even go to the limit of allowing Government personnel to accept office under foreign countries. Will we let them take the oath of allegiance to those countries? Nothing here says they cannot. Are we going to send a man from here and say he can take the oath of allegiance to that country and then be loyal to our own? I find not a word that says you cannot.

Let us take one more item and then quit. We go over to training in section 404. In this we not only provide that all the boys can go, or all the boys can come, but we say that the United States is authorized to give training and orientation courses for the boys that come and the boys that go. I do not know how anything could be written broader, or anything could be written for which more money could be spent, or how this House could waive its authority any more than it does if it passes this bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman referred to section 201 as though there was a limitation, depending on the appropriations. No; it does not depend on the appropriations. There is no limitation whatever in line 9, page 3, dealing with students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, and professors. Only the Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries. It does not depend upon appropriations.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I simply remove the previous qualification and say there is no limit. I hope the bill will be recommitment for revision.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may be in need of amendment as has been suggested. If so, I am happy to see amendments offered and will work in certain cases for

their approval. In general, I approve of the intent and purpose of the bill.

Most of the discussion we have heard today has been criticism of the personnel who produce the Voice of America. It has been said that many persons connected with OWI have been retained and are still connected with this work. I do not have first hand knowledge but I cannot concur in the criticism either of the OWI or its successor, VOA. I have known some of the young men connected with this splendid work and I know of their fine intelligence, good Americanism and intense loyalty, therefore I would stake my life that their part of this great work has been well done. While I am on the matter of high quality and competency as well as deep loyalty and patriotism, I would like to express my entire confidence, not only in the young men referred to but in Mr. Benton, now at the head of the agency. But I should like to say a word now concerning the provisions for exchange of instructors and students with other nations.

Having been a college instructor I have had some experience which bears somewhat on this matter. I have not been a student in foreign lands but I have had instructors from abroad and I think I can properly evaluate them. As an instructor I have had foreign students and whether I did them any good or not I know what impressions they made on me, and that is what I would like to suggest very briefly.

One of the most effective instructors that I ever had through my school career was a Nordic whose English I could follow with difficulty but whose scientific instruction made a deep impression upon me. He had degrees from several universities in northwestern Europe and he gave me information and impressions of the peoples and institutions of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden which were virtually equivalent to college studies there.

I did have an exchange professor from Germany at a period between the two World Wars, and of all things, he taught the danger-charged subject of economics. It was at a time when Germany was giving birth to nazism and he was a choice product of a German university. Was he a dangerous subversive? And did he delude me and pollute my mind and that of other students? He did not. I have often thought of that man and wondered about him. If he went back to Germany or was in Germany at the time when Hitler came to power, I know he would have been the first to have been thrown into a concentration camp, for all of his teachings were exactly the reverse of what the Hitler philosophy embodied. If Germany had had more men like him, Hitler would never have been more than a paper hanger.

As an instructor have I had foreign students? Yes, several interesting ones. One of these foreigners was a mature man, a brilliant fellow, a Russian, directly from the land of the former Czars. Ah, was he a Nihilist? Or a Bolshevik? Did he carry bombs? No, he had a great deal of spirit but not of the kind you might suppose. He was a White Russian, a Greek Catholic priest and he had seen

members of his own family cut down by the Reds, and had barely escaped across Siberia with his life. He is the only person of Russian blood I have ever known, and I learned more from him than he learned from me. I would be glad to admit students from Russia like him.

Have I had orientals as students? Yes; Chinese, Japanese, and turbaned Hindus. Those orientals disquieted and embarrassed me by their earnestness and eagerness to learn. One illustration will suffice.

In an educational lecture before a class containing one of these Hindu students I mentioned a little book entitled "Leonard and Gertrude" while discussing Pestalozzi and other educational reformers. Imagine my pleased surprise that evening in the university library, while most of the members of that group were probably attending social functions, to find that Hindu student poring over the little book by Pestalozzi. As I passed him I casually inquired, "Do you find that interesting?" Said he, with great earnestness, "I must translate this into the language of my people." In a lengthy conversation with him I discovered his reason for that determination.

Has America had any successful experience in the matter of exchange of students? Several years ago the University of Arizona for a considerable period regularly exchanged students with the University of Mexico. I am convinced that that cultural exchange has had an important influence upon the friendly relations of our two countries. No one will deny that the presence of so many Chinese students in American schools, supported by the Boxer fund, have improved their knowledge of and their attitude toward the United States. If time permitted, I could tell of further improvements in American-Chinese relationship by the labors of high-class instructors in such Chinese universities as at Nanking. I am convinced further that only through the exchange of information and cultural appreciation with the other important peoples of the world can we make ourselves a little more secure in this dangerous situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries, which constitute obstacles to peace, and to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, by means of—

- (1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;
- (2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation; and
- (3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people, and the principles and objectives of its Government.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "correct misunderstandings about the United States

in other countries, which constitute obstacles to peace, and to."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, tonight National University will honor itself by honoring our distinguished Parliamentarian. No man in the history of law has ever been more worthy of the degree of doctor of laws than Lew Deschler, once a son of Ohio but now grown too great in our esteem to be claimed by any State—he is now the property of the Nation, and peculiarly the property of the House of Representatives which he has served so faithfully, so fairly, and with such ability as to earn all the honors which could be heaped upon him.

I know that those of you who are not privileged to know this honor that is coming to that great institution in this great city of ours will wish to know that our own beloved Lew Deschler is to be crowned king of lawyers by this institution tonight in his own right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and to include the text of an amendment he proposes to offer to the bill.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly

passed by both Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to announce the program for next week.

On Monday and Tuesday we will take up first matters from the Committee on the District of Columbia, including, as I understand it, the tax bill. Also House Concurrent Resolution 49, which is an adverse report on Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Then the unfinished business, of course, will be the further consideration of H. R. 3342, which has been before the House today.

We had scheduled for this week H. R. 3492, having to do with the disposition of war housing. Not having been able to dispose of that this week, that will come on, I trust, on Tuesday, for consideration.

On Wednesday it is expected that the Government corporations appropriation bill will be ready for consideration and it will probably continue through Thursday.

On Friday we hope to have ready for consideration the legislative appropriation bill and also a deficiency appropriation bill.

Of course, conference reports may be called up at any time; and also any rules or matters that are urgent may be called up if time permits.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. There will be a definite commitment with reference to Saturday, the 14th, Flag Day? There will be no session on that day, 1 week from tomorrow, will there?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say about that. We are running into short time on many of the appropriation bills. I am hopeful that we may consider them expeditiously and bring them to passage at as early a time as possible. I cannot say about a week from tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made and incorporate certain extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain statistics.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Country Gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made last evening.

PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942 FOR CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the Consent Calendar the bill S. 321, an act to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 for cadets and midshipmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the day and any other special orders today I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GAMBLE (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1947 NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT OBJECTIVE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICE SYSTEM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to speak on the subject of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, which, we are told, will come to the floor next Tuesday. It is rare in legislative procedures for very simple issues to be so distorted and confused as they have been in connection with the consideration of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947. Obscured in the testimony presented before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are a few sound, simple facts upon which the President's reorganization plan rests. Briefly, these facts are:

First. The Wagner-Peyser Act of June 6, 1933, established the United States Employment Service Bureau in the Department of Labor.

Second. The failure of the States to make adequate provision for taking claims of unemployed workers in 1933 resulted in the diversion of the facilities of the United States Employment Service to claims taking activities and the financing of the Employment Service facilities out of funds appropriated under title III of the Social Security Act.

Third. The inadequacy of our Nation-wide system of public-employment offices for dealing with the war-emergency problems led to its federalization and subsequent transfer to the War Manpower Commission.

Fourth. With the liquidation of the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service was returned to the United States Department of Labor in order that it could be in an agency of Cabinet status and where its functions could be coordinated with closely related activities in the field of labor.

Fifth. In the Department of Labor, the United States Employment Service has operated efficiently.

Sixth. During the period when the United States Employment Service was in the Federal Security Agency, the finding of jobs for workers was subordinated to the function of paying them benefits.

Seventh. In the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the Congress provided that the Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that Service as an operating entity.

Eighth. The President's reorganization plan assures that administration of the United States Employment Service as an operating entity and protects it against again becoming subordinated to the negative program of paying benefits instead of finding jobs for unemployed workers.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

When State unemployment compensation benefit payments began in 1933, the facilities of the public employment offices, which had been established under the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933, were expanded so that these offices could apply the work test for the State unemployment compensation authorities. To finance the speedy expansion of Employment Service facilities, funds were granted to the States under title III of the Social Security Act which authorized the payment of administrative costs of the State unemployment compensation programs.

Because of the failure of the States to make adequate provision for taking claims of unemployed workers, the facilities of the United States Employment Service were commandeered for this purpose. Employment Service facilities were diverted away from their original purpose of finding jobs for workers to taking claims. This diversion of facilities together with the emergency method of financing the expansion of the Service led to the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Social Security Board in the newly established Federal Security Administration in 1939.

The defense program revealed glaring inadequacy in our Nation-wide system of public employment offices for dealing with the problems then emerging and the system was placed under Federal operation in January 1942. Later the same year, the United States Employment Service was transferred to the War Manpower Commission to which responsibility for the recruitment of our civilian manpower had been assigned. Here its activities were rapidly expanded and it acted as the main operating arm of that agency until after VJ-day.

With the imminent liquidation of the War Manpower Commission in 1945, it was necessary for the President to carefully review the situation and determine whether the United States Employment

Service should be returned to the Federal Security Agency. After analyzing all alternatives the President recognized that the United States Employment Service program had fared poorly during the period when it had been integrated with unemployment compensation in the Federal Security Administration. We also recognized that the United States Employment Service program was more closely related to the functions of the Department of Labor than to the functions carried on by the Federal Security Administration. The Employment Service was, therefore, returned, by Executive Order 9617, to the Department of Labor where it had originally been placed by Congress. It continued as a federally operated program in the Department of Labor until November 16, 1946, when the administration of the State and local offices was transferred back to the States in accordance with the Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act for 1947.

The successful experience of the United States Employment Service since its return to the Department of Labor in 1945, where Congress had originally placed it, substantiates the President's conclusion that its continued effective operation depends upon its remaining permanently in that Department.

The President's plan is further supported by congressional action which established the Department of Labor. Congress stated that—

The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners in the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance workers' opportunities for profitable employment.

It should be perfectly apparent to everyone that the Department of Labor cannot effectively carry out its statutory obligation to advance workers' opportunities for profitable employment without some responsibility for the only Nation-wide agency established specifically to advance workers' opportunities for profitable employment.

Incidentally, the President's action was earlier endorsed by the Republican Party in its platform of 1944, which states:

The Department of Labor has been emasculated by the New Deal. Labor bureaus, agencies, and committees are scattered far and wide, in Washington and throughout the country, and have no semblance of systematic or responsible organization. All governmental labor activities must be placed under the direct authority and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor.

An analysis of the activities of the Department of Labor reveals that there is an important working relationship between the Employment Service and every operating division in the Department of Labor—the Wage and Hour Division, Apprentice Training, Conciliation Service, and other divisions concerned with fostering, promoting, and developing the welfare of the wage earners of the United States.

Since the return of the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor it has grown in vigor and effectiveness. In 1946 the public employment offices handled one of the largest work

loads in all peacetime history. Reconversion employment problems were handled promptly and efficiently. A well-balanced program was introduced throughout the Nation, and this program, together with the State and local office facilities, were transferred to State administration with scarcely any interruption in the service. Federal-State relations were established on a sounder basis than ever before.

The contribution of the public Employment Service has been reflected in the economic well-being of this country. In 1946 the number of calls made at public employment offices for job placements, job information, job counseling, and other related services totaled 134,600,000; an average of 11,200,000 calls for each month. The number of job applications during the same period amounted to 10,400,000; an average of 864,500 each month. Employment counseling interviews totaled 1,362,000; an average of 113,500 per month. Job referrals averaged 1,059,000. Employer service calls totaled 1,723,000; an average of 143,600 per month.

Services to veterans during 1946 represented a substantial part of the total activities. For example, 5,640,000 job applications were from veterans. Employment-counseling interviews to veterans amounted to 1,015,000. There were 4,508,000 local job referrals of veterans.

The number of handicapped job seekers totaled 643,000 during 1946, with approximately 429,000 disabled veterans in this group. Employment-counseling activities to the handicapped expanded markedly during 1946 and totaled 209,000 initial interviews for the period. Job-placement activities also increased, and a total of 214,000 local placements of handicapped workers were made during the year. Approximately 138,500, or 65 percent of all job placements for handicapped workers, were disabled veterans.

The public employment offices made 7,140,000 job placements during the year, of which approximately 5,519,000 were made in nonagricultural employment; of these about 2,033,000 were veterans.

The placement activities of the public employment offices extend to all types of employment. For example, more than 40.2 percent of the placements are made in manufacturing industries; another 15.5 percent in trade; about 11.5 percent in construction; and the remaining placements are distributed in service, household, and other employments.

It is estimated that the placements made in manufacturing constituted more than 20 percent of the total workers hired, in contrast with approximately 10 to 13 percent when the United States Employment Service was in the Federal Security Administration.

WORK TEST

The fact that the local offices of the public employment service apply the work test for the State unemployment compensation authorities had led to widespread misunderstanding and to the erroneous conclusion that the main purpose of the public employment offices is to facilitate the taking of claims and payment of benefits; in other words, that the tail does and should wag the dog.

The work test requires that a prospective claimant for unemployment compensation benefits register with the local employment office to see if the office has a job opening for which he is qualified. If such a job exists the employment office refers the worker, and if he is found to be satisfactory by the employer and accepts the job, the unemployment compensation authorities are in no way involved. If the worker refuses the employment, the facts are reported to the unemployment compensation authorities for such action as they deem appropriate in connection with the worker's claim for benefits. If no job is available, it is necessary for the claimant to report at regular intervals to the employment office as evidence that he has not obtained employment or has not left the labor market; in short, that he is able and willing to work.

Upon the sands of this simple functional relationship between the two programs has been built labyrinthian arguments that the United States Employment Service must now be ripped from its moorings—its working relationships with other bureaus promoting the welfare of the wage earner severed—and transferred to the agency concerned with education, public health, cancer control, public assistance, infant and child care, food and drug administration, and similar programs.

SUBORDINATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICE TO UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION FUNCTIONS

The testimony presented makes it abundantly clear that the Employment Service program was completely subordinated to the unemployment-compensation functions from shortly after the time the Social Security Board encouraged the States with model draft legislation until the emergency federalization of the Service in 1942. Yet the opponents of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, with protesting piety, now declare that they, too, recognize that the public employment-office activities—the aggressive development of job opportunities and placement of unemployed workers—should take precedence over the payment of benefits to unemployed workers. The fact remains, however, that so long as the two programs were under the direction of the Federal Security Agency emphasis was placed inescapably upon the prompt payment of benefits, and Employment Service staff was diverted to claims-taking activities. The finding of employment opportunities for workers was neglected.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Administrators attempts to dismiss these facts by saying that at the time most States began paying benefits in 1938, we were in the midst of a recession. He further asserts that if the same conditions were to arise again, the same sort of neglect of finding employment opportunities for unemployed workers would occur. According to the witness, "There were no jobs and all we used our personnel for was to line them"—unemployed workers—"up. There were no jobs to refer them to."

The facts are that in 1938, the year to which the witness refers, over 4,000,000

workers found employment in manufacturing activities alone, and manufacturing at the time engaged only about 20 percent of our working population. What happened was that workers found employment through their own unaided efforts when employment-office facilities were being used for lining up unemployed workers so that they could be given not jobs but benefits.

One of the primary responsibilities of the public employment office is to facilitate the employment of workers by providing a central point in each community where workers may ascertain the existence of job openings and employers the existence of available workers to cut down the loss of time between jobs. The conclusion that the Employment Service personnel should be used for lining up unemployed workers for claims payment, instead of lining up jobs for such workers reflects either a gross misunderstanding of the purpose of a public-employment-office system or a callous indifference to the welfare of our working population.

It should be apparent to everyone, as was pointed out by the Under Secretary of Labor in his testimony before the Committee that where you have an integration of the functions of the unemployment compensation and employment service with an interchangeability of staff, the payment of benefits inevitably takes precedence over the searching out of suitable jobs for unemployed workers.

So persistent is the propensity to subordinate the public-employment-service functions to those of paying unemployment-compensation benefits that Congress has had to take cognizance of the fact in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. In section 604 of that act, Congress provides that, "The Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that service as an operating entity."

Congress has decided that this provision is necessary to assure, as far as veterans are concerned, that no administrative reorganization shall be permitted to divert the efforts of the public employment service from providing effective employment assistance and job counseling to veterans. Congress, in fact, has guarded against a repetition of past mistakes by rescinding that portion of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1939, which unfortunately consolidated the functions of the United States Employment Service with those of the unemployment-compensation program. This mistake was not rectified until the federalization of the system in 1942.

BUDGETS, ACCOUNTING, AND EXPENDITURES PROCEDURES

In some of the testimony presented before the committee, an attempt was made to tie the functions of the unemployment compensation and employment service programs together on the basis of their budget, accounting, and expenditure procedures. The cost of administration of both programs in the States is financed 100 percent by the Federal Government, and on the basis of the testimony, one might come to the erroneous conclusion that if the unemployment compensation and employment service programs were brought together

under a single direction in the Federal Administration that there would be no necessity for the States to account for funds they receive from the Federal Government.

Congress in fact makes three appropriations for three distinct programs administered by the State agencies. The State agencies administer, first, the public employment offices; second, State unemployment compensation system; and, third, Servicemen's Readjustment Allowances. In accordance with the purposes of the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Congress appropriates funds for the administration of public employment offices. It likewise appropriates funds, in accordance with title III of the Social Security Act for the administration of State unemployment compensation systems. Appropriations for the administration of Servicemen's Readjustment Allowances are made to the Veterans' Administration, and are granted to the States in accordance with budget requests prepared by the States for the purpose of administering the payment of Servicemen's Readjustment Allowances.

The States are permitted to commingle the funds appropriated for the three different programs in a single account. From these commingled funds they may finance temporary excess expenditures for any particular program. States cannot, however, permanently transfer funds appropriated by the Congress for one program and use those funds to finance another program.

Those who attempt to masquerade the points at issue by shrouding them in budget, accounting, and expenditure procedures forget that Congress is not ready to abdicate its responsibilities and to dish out funds with no accounting from the States for their expenditures for the specific purposes for which the funds have been appropriated. In other words, Congress is not willing to appropriate funds for one program and find these funds being transferred and used for the expansion of another program contrary to the wishes of Congress. Wherever the United States Employment Service might be located, it would be necessary for the States to itemize funds for the employment service program as distinct from other programs in order to obtain administrative grants which Congress appropriates for employment service purposes.

CONCERN OF STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATORS

Some of the members of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Administrators testified that the Employment Service does not belong in the Department of Labor because that Department was established by Congress to promote the welfare of labor. They fail to explain, however, how the Department of Labor could carry out its obligations to advance opportunities for profitable employment for workers independently of the Employment Service activities. Interestingly enough, in approximately a third of the States both unemployment compensation and employment service administration is located in either the State department of labor or agencies dealing with labor matters. For example, both the unemploy-

ment compensation and employment service are located in the department of labor in New York, Wisconsin, Georgia, and Illinois, to mention only a few States. These departments have continuing relationships with the United States Department of Labor in connection with apprentice training, wages and hours administration, labor statistics, and similar matters affecting employment problems. All evidence indicates that the location of these programs in the departments of labor in the States in no way impairs the effectiveness of either program. As a matter of fact, the programs have been more effectively administered in the department of labor in some States than they have in an independent agency in others.

On the basis of the testimony a thoughtful person might ask why the State employment security administrators are so anxious to have the Federal agencies responsible for the employment-service program transferred to the Federal Security Agency where the unemployment compensation program is located. The answer is quite simple. The State employment security administrators have a sharp eye on their own personal interests.

The employment-security administrators are afraid that the pattern of organization recommended by the President for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service might eventually be adopted by some of the States to the personal disadvantage of the administrators who now in most instances have control of both the unemployment compensation and employment service programs. While this possibility seems extremely remote, it is understandable that some State bureaucrats are likely to be apprehensive about any possible action that might adversely affect their bureaucratic interests. This apprehension has been repeatedly manifest in their opposition to strengthening the Veteran's Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 FOR STRONG EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

There is one point concerning which there is unanimous agreement—that finding a man a job is far more important than the paying of unemployment benefits. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 seeks to support this principal by continuing the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor where it will be protected against subordination to the unemployment compensation program.

On the basis of our review of the history, experience, and accomplishments of the public employment service in this country it is our firm conviction that the interest of this system will be best advanced by the continuance of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor in accordance with the President's plan.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1135. An act to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as

amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, June 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

756. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 13, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of the inland waterway from New Orleans, La., to Apalachicola River, Fla., and the Apalachicola and Chattahoochee Rivers to Columbus, Ga., authorized by section 8 of the River and Harbor Act approved on March 3, 1925 (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

757. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 31, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Redstone Creek, Pa., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

758. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 for the various departments and agencies (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$747,660 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

760. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$785,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

761. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$12,026,000, together with a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

762. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$23,065,000 for the Office of Rent Control, Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

763. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$700,000 to the President for the fiscal year 1948, containing a clause relating to a restriction on the use of a 1947 appropriation (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$8,124.07 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$53,700 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$194,000 for the Indian Claims Commission (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$2,700,000 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

767. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$125,000 for the War Department for civil functions in the form of an amendment to the budget for said year (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 in the amount of \$2,059,500, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations, and proposed authorizations for the expenditure of power and other revenues and Indian tribal funds, for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$2,551,300 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

770. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of Navy equipment to the Miami Power Squadron; to the Committee on Armed Services.

771. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1634. A bill to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 599. A bill declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3484. A bill to trans-

fer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; with an amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EATES of Massachusetts: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3737. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Anna Malama Mark; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 3744. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3745. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to increase the benefit amounts for certain workers covered under the act after 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 3746. A bill to decontrol sugar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3747. A bill to provide for the sale by the Federal Works Administrator of the property situated in Washington, D. C., known as the Capitol Park Hotel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 3748. A bill to provide additional compensation to widows and other dependents of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3749. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3750. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3751. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Grenada County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Montgomery County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 234. Resolution that the President's message of June 4, 1947, transmitting a report of the Advisory Commission on Universal Training dated May 29, 1947, be printed as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3754. A bill for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlbom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Kitty Hayes, Eunice Hayes, Kathryn Hayes, and Florence Hayes Gaines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

608. By Mr. HULL: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., with reference to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

609. By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Petition of the Ukrainian American Citizens' Association, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 2810, a bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens or members of our armed forces, by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to a part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

610. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Veterans' Committee, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a change in the naturalization laws which was enacted by the twenty-fourth session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

611. Also, petition of American Veterans' Committee, Territory of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Congress to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

612. Also, petition of Conrad Post, No. 179, of the American Legion, Petersburg, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting laws that will give the veterans of World War I the same benefits, pensions, and relief as the Spanish-American War veterans are now receiving; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Forgive us, O God, that we are so anxious, in all we say and do, to have